

(SRI K. F. PATIL)

Written examination:—Candidates will be selected on the basis of an examination to be conducted by the State Public Service Commission in the following subject:—

- (i) General knowledge ... 100 marks
- (ii) Essay in English ... 100 marks
- (iii) Mathematics ... 100 marks

(Matriculation standard)
and Algebra (Intermediate standard).

(iv) Any two papers out of the following:—

Botany	} 100 marks each
Zoology	
Mathematics	
Chemistry	
Physics	
Geology	
Mechanical	
Engineering	
Agriculture	

The standard of the examination in these subjects will be that of a Bachelor's Degree.

Interview.—The State Public Service Commission will arrange for the interview of candidates and award marks on the basis of general bearing, physique, personality and interest in an out-door life. There will be 200 marks for the interview.

Governor's Message

Mr. SPEAKER.—I have received a message from His Highness the Governor of Mysore, which reads as follows:—

“ 12th March 1960.

To

The Members of the Legislative Assembly.

I have received with great satisfaction the expression of your thanks for the speech with which I opened the Budget Session 1960, of both Houses of the Legislature.

JAYACHAMARAJA WADIYAR,
Governor of Mysore.”

Minister's Statement

†Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—During question hour I promised to furnish information to Hon'ble member Sri Veerendra Patil about Chincholi-Sulepet road. That road is a non-planned one and the Hon'ble member was referring to the statement of works included in the Second Five-Year Plan (Non-planned works). It is an error. Therefore it is correct that that road is a non-planned work and it is going on under Government of India grant-in-aid scheme.

SPECIAL MOTION RR : BOMBAY AND MYSORE BORDER ADJUSTMENTS.

(Debate continued)

ಶ್ರೀಮತಿ ನಾಗರತ್ನಮ್ಮ (ಗಾಂಧಿ ನಗರ).—ಮಾನ್ಯ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರೇ, ಈಗ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ತಂದಿರುವ ಗಡಿ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ನಿರ್ಣಯವನ್ನು ಅನುಮೋದಿಸುತ್ತಾ ಒಂದೆರಡು ಮಾತುಗಳನ್ನು ಹೇಳಬೇಕೆಂದಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಇದುವರೆಗೂ ಅನೇಕ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಅನೇಕ ವಿಷಯಗಳನ್ನು ತಿಳಿಸಿ ಪಡಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಮತ್ತು ತಮ್ಮ ಸ್ಥಿತಿವಾದ ಅನುಮೋದನೆಯನ್ನು ವ್ಯಕ್ತಪಡಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಕನ್ನಡಿಗರು ಯಾವ ಪ್ರಚೋದನೆಯನ್ನೂ ಮಾಡದೆ, ಶಾಂತಿ ಪ್ರಿಯರಾಗಿದ್ದ ಮಾತ್ರಕ್ಕೇ, ಸುಮ್ಮನಿದ್ದ ಮಾತ್ರಕ್ಕೇ ಸತ್ಯಹೀನರೆಂದು ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದರೆ, ಅದು ಮರಾಠಿ ಸೋಲರರ ತಪ್ಪುಭಾವನೆ ಎಂಬುದಾಗಿ ನಾನು ನೋಚಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಹಿಂದಿನಿಂದಲೂ, ಬಹು ಹಿಂದಿನಿಂದಲೂ ಕನ್ನಡಿಗರು ಶೂರರು, ಗುಂಡುಗಲಗಳು. ಪುರುಷರಷ್ಟೇ ಅಲ್ಲ, ಮಹಿಳೆಯರೂ ಕೂಡ ವೀರನಾರಿಯರು, ರಣಚಂಡಿಯರೆಂಬ ಬಿರುದು ಪಡೆದವರೆಂಬುದನ್ನು ಮರಾಠಿ ಸೋಲರರು ಮರೆಯಬಾರದು. ಹಿಂದೇನು, ಇಂದೂ ಕೂಡ ವೀರನಾರಿಯರಿದ್ದಾರೆಂದು ಅವರು ಮರೆಯಬಾರದು.

ಮರಾಠಿ ಸೋಲರರು ತಮ್ಮ ವಲ್ಲದ ಪದೇಶಗಳನ್ನು ದಕ್ಕಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳಲು ಕರನಿರಾಕರಣ ಮುಂತಾದ ಚಳವಳಿ ನಡೆಸುತ್ತಿರುವುದು ಬಹಳ ಅನ್ಯಾಯ ಮತ್ತು ಖಂಡನೀಯವಾದುದು. ಇಂಥ ಅನ್ಯಾಯ ಮಾರ್ಗಗಳನ್ನು ಅವರು ಹಿಡಿಯಬಾರದಾಗಿತ್ತು. ಸುಮಾರು ಏಳು ಸಾವಿರ ಚದರ ಮೈಲಿ ಪ್ರದೇಶ, ಮುಪತ್ತೆಯಾದ ಲಕ್ಷ ಕನ್ನಡಿಗರ ಪ್ರಜಾ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ ಕನ್ನಡ ನಾಡಿಗೆ ಸೇರಬೇಕಾಗಿತ್ತು. ನಾವು ಕೂಡ ನಮಗೆ ಇಷ್ಟು ಪ್ರದೇಶ ಮತ್ತು ಜನರು ಸೇರಬೇಕೆಂದು ಚಳವಳಿ ಮಾಡಬಹುದಾಗಿತ್ತು. ಒಬ್ಬ ಕವಿ ಹೇಳಿದಂತೆ “ ಕಳೆದು ಹೋದ ಹೊನ್ನು ನೆಲವು ಮರಳಿದೊರೆವುದೆಂದಿಗೇ! ಜೊಂಕ ಕಟ್ಟಿ ನಿಡುನಾಗು ಅದನು ಪಡೆಯಲಿಂಗಿ ” ಎಂದು ನಾವೂ ಕೂಡ ದಿಟ್ಟತನದಿಂದ ನಮ್ಮ ಪ್ರದೇಶವನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಲು

MYSORE BORDER ADJUSTMENTS

ಬೇಕಾದಷ್ಟು ಚಳವಳಿಯನ್ನು ಮಾಡಬಹುದಾಗಿತ್ತು. ಆದರೆ ಕನ್ನಡಿಗರು ಶಾಂತಿ ಪ್ರಿಯರಾಗಿರುವಾಗ ಇಂಥ ಅನ್ಯಾಯ ಮಾರ್ಗ ಸಲ್ಲದೆಂದು ನುಮ್ಮಂದೇಲಿ ವೆಂಬುದನ್ನು ಮರಾಠ ಸೋದರರು ಕಂಡುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಬೆಳಗಾಂ ನಮ್ಮದು, ಸುತ್ತಮುತ್ತಲ ಪ್ರದೇಶ ನಮ್ಮದು ಎಂದು ಅವರ ಹೇಳಿದರೆ ನಾವು ಪೂನಾ ನಮ್ಮದು ಸುತ್ತಮುತ್ತಲ ಪ್ರದೇಶಗಳು ನಮ್ಮವು ಎಂದು ಚಳವಳಿಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಆದರೆ ಈ ಮಾರ್ಗ ಸತ್ಯವಂತರೂ ಶಾಂತಿಪ್ರಿಯರೂ ಆದ ಕನ್ನಡಿಗರಿಗೆ ಸಲ್ಲದು. ಮೊನ್ನೆ ತಾನೆ ಒಬ್ಬ ಸೋದರರು ಮಾತನಾಡುತ್ತ ಕೊಂಕಣಿಯವರು ಮರಾಠರೆಂಬ ಭಾವನೆಯನ್ನು ತೋರಿಸಿದರು. ನಮ್ಮ ಬೆಂಗಳೂರಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಅನೇಕ ಭಾಷೆಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾತನಾಡುವವರು ಬಂದು ಸೇರಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅವರವರಿಗೆ ಬೇಕಾದ ಭಾಷೆಯನ್ನು ಮಾತನಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ನಾಳೆ ಅವರು ನಮ್ಮ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚಾಗಿದೆ, ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ನಮ್ಮದೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರೆ ಅದು ಒಪ್ಪುವ ಮಾತಲ್ಲ. ಹೀಗೆಯೇ ಬೆಳಗಾವಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಮರಾಠರು ನಾವು ಬಹುಸಂಖ್ಯಾತರು, ಬೆಳಗಾಂವ್ ಮತ್ತು ಸುತ್ತಮುತ್ತಲ ಪ್ರದೇಶ ತಮ್ಮದು ಎಂದರೆ ಈ ವಾದವನ್ನು ಯಾರೂ ಒಪ್ಪುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ, ಇದು ಸಾಧ್ಯವೂ ಅಲ್ಲ. ಈಗ ಅವರ ಆಡಳಿತದಲ್ಲಿರುವ ಕೊರಾಪುರ, ಅಕ್ಕಲಕೋಟೆ, ಕೊರಾಪುರ ಮೊದಲಾದ ಪ್ರದೇಶಗಳನ್ನು ವಾಪಸು ಪಡೆಯಲು ನಾವು ಇದುವರೆಗೂ ಚಳವಳಿ ಹೂಡದಿರುವುದೇ ತಪ್ಪೋ ಏನೋ, ನಾವೂ ಮೊದಲೆ ಚಳವಳಿ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಿದ್ದರೆ ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿತ್ತೋ ಏನೋ, ನಾವು ಶಾಂತಿ ಪ್ರಿಯರಾಗಿ ತಳ್ಳಿಕೊಂಡು ಬಂದದ್ದೇ ತಪ್ಪಾಯಿತೋ ಏನೋ ಎನಿಸುತ್ತದೆ. ನಮಗೂ ಚಳವಳಿಮಾಡಲು ಬೇಕಾದಷ್ಟು ಬರುತ್ತದೆ; ಆದರೆ ಶಾಂತಿಪ್ರಿಯರು ಈ ಮಾರ್ಗವನ್ನು ನುಸರಿರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ ಈಗಲೂ ನಾವು ನಮ್ಮ ಕನ್ನಡಿಗರನ್ನು ಹುರಿದುಂಬಿಸಬಹುದು 'ಸರಿಯುಬಹುದು ಒಂದು ವೇಳೆ ಆಚಲರಿಯು ಮೇರು ದೊರೆಯದೊಂದು ನನ್ನ ನಾಡ ತುಂಡು' ಎಂದರೆ, ಮೇರು ಪರ್ವತ ಒಂದು ವೇಳೆ ಸರಿದರೂ ನಮ್ಮ ನಾಡಿನ ಒಂದು ತುಂಡು ಪ್ರದೇಶವನ್ನೂ ಬಿಟ್ಟು ಕೊಡಲಾರವೆಂದು ಹುರಿದುಂಬಿಸಬಹುದು. ಆದರೆ ನಾವು ಮೊದಲಿನಿಂದಲೂ ಸತ್ಯ ಪ್ರಿಯರು, ಶಾಂತಿ ಪ್ರಿಯರು ಇದರಿಂದ ನುಮ್ಮಂದೇಲಿವೆಂಬುದನ್ನು ಮರಾಠ ಸೋದರರು ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕು. ಅವರದಾದ ಒಂದೆಂಗುಲ ನೆಲವೂ ನಮಗೆ ಬೇಡ. ನಮ್ಮದಾದ ಒಂದೆಂಗುಲ ನೆಲವನ್ನೂ ಕೊಡುವುದು ಬೇಡ, ಈಗ ಮಾಡಿರುವ 'ಮೈಸೂರ್ ಅಡ್ಮಿನ್‌ಸ್ಟ್ರೇಷನ್' ನಿರ್ಣಯಕ್ಕೆ ಶಾಂತಿ ಸಂಧಾನಕ್ಕೆ ಮರಾಠ ಸೋದರರು ಒಪ್ಪಿದರೆ ಸರಿ, ಇಲ್ಲವಾದರೆ ಕನ್ನಡಿಗರಾದ ನಾವು ಶಾಸನಬದ್ಧವಾದ ಶಾಂತಿ ಹೋರಾಟವನ್ನು ನಡೆಸಿಯಾದರೂ ನಮ್ಮ ಪ್ರದೇಶಗಳನ್ನು ದೊರಕಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳಲು ಈಗಲೂ ಸಿದ್ಧರಾಗಿದ್ದೇವೆಂದು ಘಂಟಾ ಘೋಷವಾಗಿ ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಈ ಕೆಲಸ ಸಾಧಿಸುವುದರಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮುಖ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಯಾರ ಬಿಡೆ ಭೀತಿಗೂ ಕಿವಿಗೊಡದೆ, ಅಂಜದೆ, ಅಳುಕದೆ ಕನ್ನಡಿಗರಿಗೆ ಅನ್ಯಾಯವಾಗದಂತೆ ಧೈರ್ಯವಾಗಿ ನಡೆಯಲೆಂದು ಮನವಿ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಬೆಳಗಾಂವ್ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಚಳವಳಿ ನಡೆಸುತ್ತಿರುವುದು ಯಾವ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದಲೂ ಸಮಂಜಸವಲ್ಲ. ಈ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆ ಈ ಹಿಂದೆಯೇ ಪಾರ್ಲಿಮೆಂಟಿನಲ್ಲಿ ನಿರ್ಧರವಾಗಿದೆ, ಬೆಳಗಾಂ ಮೈಸೂರು ಆಡಳಿತಕ್ಕೆ ಸೇರಿ ಮೂರು ವರ್ಷಗಳ ಮೇರಾಯಿತು. ಹೀಗಿದ್ದರೂ ಬೆಳಗಾಂ

ನಮಗೆ ಸೇರಬೇಕೆಂದು ಮರಾಠ ಸೋದರರು ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿರುವ ಚಳವಳಿ ಅನ್ಯಾಯ; ಇದು ಸಂಕುಚಿತ ಮನೋಭಾವದ ನಾಗೇಂದಿತನದ ಮಾತಾಗಿದೆ; ನಾವು ಕೂಡ ಪೂನಾ ನಮ್ಮದು, ಸುತ್ತಮುತ್ತಲ ಪ್ರದೇಶ ನಮ್ಮದು ಎಂದು ಕೇಳಿದರೆ ಅವರು ಒಪ್ಪುತ್ತಾರೆಯೇ ಎಂದು ಸವಾಲು ಹಾಕುತ್ತೇನೆ. ನಮ್ಮಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ಗಾದೆ ಇದೆ, 'ಅಡವಿಯಲ್ಲಿದ್ದ ದೆವ್ವ ಊರಿಗೆ ಬಂದು ಊರ ದೆವ್ವವನ್ನು ಒಡಿಸಿತು, ಎಂದು. ನಮ್ಮ ಕನ್ನಡ ನಾಡಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಹುಟ್ಟಿ ಬೆಳೆದ ಕನ್ನಡಿಗರು ಎಷ್ಟು ಜನ ಅಲ್ಲಿದ್ದಾರೆಂದು ನೋಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳಲಿ, ಈ ಗಡಿಯ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಯ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ನಮ್ಮ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಕೈಕೊಳ್ಳುವ ದಿಟ್ಟತನದ ನ್ಯಾಯಬದ್ಧವಾದ ಕಾರ್ಯಕ್ರಮಗಳಿಗೆ ನಮ್ಮ ಎರಡು ಕೋಟಿ ಕನ್ನಡಿಗರ ಸಂಪೂರ್ಣ ಬೆಂಬಲವಿದೆ ಎಂದು ನಾನು ಹೇಳಬಲ್ಲೆ. ಗಡಿಯ ರಕ್ಷಣೆಗೆ ಅಣಿಯಾಗಿ ನಿಂತಿರುವ ಎರಡು ಕೋಟಿ ಜನತೆ ಎಂದು ಮತ್ತೊಮ್ಮೆ ಸಾರಿ ಈ ನಿರ್ಣಯವನ್ನು ಹೃತ್ಪೂರ್ವಕವಾಗಿ ಅನುಮೋದಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಸಿರಿಗನ್ನಡಂ ಗೆಲ್ಲೆ ! ಕನ್ನಡ ತಾಯ್ ಬಾಳ್ಗೆ !

†Sri S. D. KOTHAVALA (Chikodi).—Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am rising to support the resolution. The most important part of the resolution is contained in the first part of the resolution. It enunciates the general principle regarding the re-opening of the boundaries between the States in India and secondly it states something by way of an exception to the general principle. The general principle is that in the interest of the unity and integrity of India and its national development, the question of boundaries should not be re-opened. That is the general principle stated. The exception is, should it be found necessary for and purpose, the resolution states, there is scope for minor adjustments on the basis of an agreement between the two States concerned. These are very important principles enunciated by the Resolution Sri, and I am going to give you a few reasons in support of these principles.

There are a number of States in India and some persons think and those persons, particularly who are agitating for the re-opening of the boundary question, think that the States in India are independent States. The tendency is towards Balkanisation of India.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN (Kolar Gold Fields).—Is it already Balkanised ?

Sri S. D. KOTHAVALA.—No. There is a tendency and we want to nip

(SRI S. D. KOTHAVALA)

it in the bud. The federal structure was prepared by the Constitution-makers of India only to meet the vastness of the country and only to provide for dealing with questions of local importance in the different areas of the country. The country is very vast and the localities and regions differ and conditions differ from place to place, from area to area. So, it was thought that it was not possible to rule the country by having a unitary State in India having one Government and one Parliament for the entire Indian Nation.

There were some political thinkers who doubted the wisdom of the Federal step up of the country. They suggested that India should be governed by a unitary Government with a complete decentralisation of powers and functions to local areas and it was then thought by these political thinkers that the creation of federal units in India, of course, was likely to create fissiparous tendencies and which are likely to affect the integrity and unity of India. Well, the fears which were raised by political thinkers seem to have proved correct to a certain extent. Though there is one citizenship for all India, we being in India are thinking that we belong to one State or the other and there are boundary disputes everywhere. One cartoon in regard to this matter appeared in *Shankar's Weekly*. It was reproduced in *Karmaveer* dated 10th January 1960. It is a small picture. I would pass it on to the Hon'ble Members if they desire to see it. He has shown here the persons residing in various States who are opposing each other with cudgels and all that. It is a very interesting picture. There are more boundary disputes than the number of States existing. That is the position. Under these circumstances, we are forgetting that India is one country where there is one common citizenship for all. It is and has been the constitutional right of everybody to go to any place in India and settle there and if the scope of this constitutional right is restricted in an indirect manner, then that will be the end of

Indian unity and Indian integrity and that is the end of the Indian Nation. Therefore, we should take steps to prevent this tendency and nip it in the bud. The threat of China on the borders of India was not contented so vehemently by some of the citizens of India. They feel that heavens are going to fall down if the boundary adjustments are not effected. That is a very strange idea and I sometimes feel that the federal structure should be scrapped and unitary Government established in India. Then it will solve many problems and put an end to these boundary disputes and consequently, developmental activities could be more efficiently implemented. A lot of correspondence goes on between the State Governments and the Union Government and red-tapism persists; there is the problem of State's share of contribution and the Union's share of contribution and there are so many troubles coming up. Therefore, I sometimes feel whether it is not in the interest of India to have a unitary State of Government in place of the federal structure. When it was found that the provincial units in India were not well-formed for the homogeneous governance of the country, the Government of India thought it fit to establish States Reorganisation Commission under the Chairmanship of Shri Fazl Ali; it is very interesting to note that the Government of India were aware of this position and they were very particular in emphasising the sense of integrity and unity of India. They called upon the Fazl Ali Commission to recommend reorganisation of States on certain principles. To put it in a nutshell, the historical, geographical and economic integrity were prescribed to be the guiding principle for the new set up and along with this they said that language also should be taken into consideration; whether it is language of historical or geographical or economic considerations, they become relevant only in the context of administrative convenience. Language was an important factor to be considered, no doubt, but that factor could be considered only along with other factors, namely, geographical, historical and economic integrity of the

area concerned. Language by itself has no particular significance in the matter. Therefore, let it be understood by all that the reorganisation that was recommended by the S. R. Commission was not merely on the language basis. Some people are entertaining a wrong idea in respect of this matter.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—Does the Hon'ble Member want Kasargod and Madakasira?

Sri S. D. KOTHAVALA.—I am coming to that. I was just saying that all these factors had to be taken into consideration by the S.R. Commission while making their recommendations. So it was not the language factor alone. The important question before the Commission was historical, geographic and economic considerations and linguistic consideration was also another basis for the reorganisation of the States. What should be the unit? Village, of course, was rejected by them, as it was a factor which would disturb the integrity of the area, and in a sense, geographical, historical and economical integrity. That was how they considered the whole thing and they accepted the principle of broader unit; and district was taken as a unit and in exceptional cases a smaller unit such as Taluk was taken. Hon'ble Members will bear in mind that integrity of the area itself was a matter considered in the formation of the State. Therefore, they came to the conclusion that the broad-based States conformed to the terms of reference under which they were appointed. Thereafter, the whole question was considered by the Parliament and considerations such as consideration of language, consideration of village as a unit, etc., were discussed thoroughly and in a complete manner and Parliament of course put its seal of sanction upon the Reorganisation suggested by the S.R. Commission with certain modifications. Speaking about the new Mysore State, all these factors were taken into consideration. Certain persons from the Bombay State and a few persons in Belgaum and Karwar Districts are agitating for a change. If

I were to state a few facts with respect to these matters and as to how completely this question was considered by the Parliament and the S.R. Commission, it would be very relevant. To speak of Karwar first, the Hon'ble House knows that both South Kanara and North Kanara constituted as one District and it was governed by the Madras Presidency. Subsequently in the interest of administrative convenience, North Kanara was carved out of this Kanara District with headquarters at Honnavar and was handed over to the Bombay Presidency. Subsequently Honnavar was found to be inconvenient and Karwar was specially built as Headquarters and this Karwar town came into being. Hon'ble Members will find that claims of certain Marathi speaking people that Karwar should be handed over to the Bombay State is not at all supported either by historical, geographical or other considerations. The town which was specially constructed as headquarters for the District cannot be parted with or handed over to any other area. Secondly, as regards Belgaum District, the House knows that Belgaum District and Dharwar District were part of Bellary District and were governed by Madras Presidency. In course of time Dharwar District was carved out of Bellary and given over to the Bombay Presidency. After a few decades, Belgaum District was also carved out and constituted a different district. Historically speaking, it is very clear that neither Karwar nor Belgaum District was ever the place of Marathi speaking people. The very names Belgaum District, South Kanara and North Kanara essentially show that Kannad language and Kannad culture are prevailing in these areas. Speaking geographically, the whole of Belgaum, then are tracts of Malnad which extends throughout the length and breadth of the Mysore State. Khanapur and some portion of Belgaum constitute a fringe of Malnad. It will thus be seen whether it will be in the interest of the people to have a division and to give a fringe of it to Bombay. Such a division is inconceivable.

(SRI S. D. KOTHA VALE)

2-30 P.M.

Another important aspect is that the Karwar area, Supapeta, Halyal and Khanapur Taluks are essentially one. For instance in Supapeta and Halyal Taluka the density of population is 15 per square mile. This House may know that it is essentially a forest area. It has very sparse population. But the area is rich in minerals and forests. Probably our Maharashtrian friends seem to have their eye on their rich mineral and forest wealth. Well, that is not important for adjustment of boundaries.

Dr. K. K. HEGDE (Minister for Public Health).—They seem to have an eye on Goa.

Sri S. D. KOTHA VALE.—Yes, Sir, they seem to have an eye on Goa also. Goa is in the Karwar District belt. If and when it comes to the Indian Union, the Maharashtrians are hoping that they will be able to get that port. But it is for the Goan people to decide whether to join this area or whether to remain independent. We have no eye on Goa.

Therefore it is not possible and it is not desirable to have a division in this area which has a long association in unity as a result of historical, geographical and climatic conditions. Under these circumstances, the claim made by Maharashtrian brothers cannot be justified. I have said in the beginning that the S.R. Commission considered the district as the unit and taluk as the unit in exceptional cases. With reference to population proportion Belgaum District contained 66 per cent Kannad population and the remaining 34 per cent consisted of other language-groups. Speaking about Chikodi taluk, the population of Kannad speaking people is 49.3 per cent, whereas the Marathi speaking people are 42.3 per cent. That is the position. Taking this aspect into consideration, as the unit, the Maharashtrian Samithi cannot lay claim to any portion of Chikodi taluk. In Hukeri taluk, they want a portion. There the population figures show a still higher

percentage of Kannad people. In Khanapur, there may be a difference of one or two per cent. We have now to consider the question on what basis a particular district or taluka is to be removed from one area to another. It was considered by the S.R. Commission. They evolved a formula. 70 per cent of the population of one culture or language was taken to be the basis for transfer. Supposing a Maharashtrian area wants to go to Karnatak area or a Karnatak area wants to go to Maharashtra, seventy per cent of the population should be speaking the language Marathi or Kannad. Having regard to the administration of the area, such a percentage is necessary. The Chief Minister of Bombay was pleased to move a resolution in the Bombay Assembly advocating village as the unit and a simple majority of 51 per cent. May I ask, if the Hon'ble Members who speak for the Maharashtrian Samithi are so very solicitous about the 51 per cent, what is to become of the remaining 49 per cent? Have the remaining, 49 per cent no status, no value, no life and no stake in the State? I think the question cannot be decided by a simple majority as such. The S.R. Commission rightly considered this question when it took 70 per cent as the basis for making adjustments or for giving one taluk or one district from one area to another. Even taking this standard, what is the position of Belgaum? It may be 50 or 51 per cent. It is not 70 per cent. That is true of Khanapur. That is true of other taluks also. I want to put in one more plea. I can understand that the question of village can be considered in a different way, if at all. The people in cities are cosmopolitan. People come to cities for various purposes, for industry, for labour and for other reasons, and for manual labour or work. The city population generally, a substantial portion, is a floating one. Supposing they find better opportunities, they go to other areas. But it is not the case with village people. They usually stick to their soil. Therefore, there is every reason for taking the higher percentage for considering the case of

cities like Belgaum and Nippani. They are commercial centres. In regard to Nippani, I may bring to the notice of the Hon'ble House that it is the foremost market for tobacco in India today. The Central Excise of that place comes to four to five crores. Many of our Maharashtrian friends have come and settled in Nippani, by getting employment in the beedi factories and the tobacco godowns. If that is so, such coming in and going out of cities cannot change the nature of the place itself. That is true of Belgaum also. I shall just give one or two figures about Belgaum. In 1941 the population of Belgaum was 57,000 and according to the 1951 census it has gone up to 1,10,000 or so. The population has almost doubled. That is because people have come there for the purpose of trade, for the purpose of work and for similar other purposes. Now, what is the claim of Maharashtra to Bombay? Bombay is an island and according to the 1951 census 57 per cent of the population was non-Marathi people and only 43 per cent was Marathi-speaking people. So, Bombay could have been constituted into a separate unit. Now, it has been decided to hand over Bombay to Maharashtra. I am very glad about it and I congratulate my Maharashtrian friends upon securing the inclusion of Bombay in Maharashtra. That is another matter, but the same principle has got to be borne in mind while considering the border question between Mysore and Bombay. Of course, it must be said to the credit of the Chief Minister of Bombay that he is not unaware of other factors besides the language which should weigh in the matter of readjustment. In the concluding portion of the resolution moved by him in the Bombay Assembly he says

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA (Gubbi).—On a point of order, Sir. Can the Hon'ble Member read from the paper?

Mr. SPEAKER.—The Hon'ble Member should not quote from the paper unless he is sure of his ground. If he is sure that such a resolution was moved by the Chief Minister of Bombay, he can make use of the paper. After

ascertaining the facts, one can quote from the paper.

Sri S. D. KOTHAVALA.—It reads thus:

“The memorandum suggested that the primary unit of habitation, namely, a village should be the unit for such demarcation, except where strong factors pointed to the contrary, such as geographical unity, economic affiliation or administrative convenience.”

The Chief Minister of Bombay was aware of these factors and I am here to emphasise the very same aspect. The bifurcation of the Bombay State is in the offing. It has been agreed to by the leaders of Maharashtra and Gujerat that Dangs District and Umbergaon Taluk are to be handed over to Gujerat. There are elements in Maharashtra which from the very beginning want to torpedo that arrangement. It is right for them to have agreed to this arrangement on the basis of the integrity of that area and if it is agreed to already, it is wrong on the part of these Maharashtrian elements to agitate against it. Now, the Chief Minister of Bombay wants to take the village as a unit for the settlement of the boundary question between Mysore and Bombay. Why did he not apply that principle in respect of Dangs and Umbergaon? I do not know whether the agitation of the M.E.S. will lead the country to destruction or to development. Time alone will show that. My submission is that the statement that in the interest of the unity of India this question should not be reopened, contained in the resolution is fully justified. The highest leadership in the country is to be blamed to a certain extent for this state of affairs. I am sorry to make that statement. In my own humble way I happened to meet certain workers of the M.E.S. in Belgaum and they say that the highest leadership in the country still says that they would consider this question and that something can be done if the States concerned come to an agreement between them. This type of answers

(SRI S. D. KOTHAVALA)

given by the highest leadership in the country has encouraged this fissiparous tendency. The people there say, let the Government of India say once and for all that this question is closed for all time to come and that they are not going to reconsider, then we shall stop our agitation. When the leadership says that they are going to consider this question the people say that they have every right to agitate. Such a halting and hesitant attitude has encouraged this border agitation and if this attitude continues I think that no border question in India is likely to be solved. So far as the agitation is concerned, some of the friends from outside the State are encouraging and inspiring it. The Karnatak organisations there can carry on an equally virulent movement there but they are keeping quiet with a view not to cause any embarrassment to the Government. It is not that they are unable to launch such a movement. If the Government of India takes a firm attitude in this matter and if they declare that the boundaries fixed by the S. R. Act are final, much of the trouble would vanish. I hope that this Hon'ble House would also share that view. If there is to be an adjustment, that can be only on the basis of an agreement between the parties concerned. The resolution says that there is scope for minor adjustment on the basis of agreement between the States concerned. Some Hon'ble Members ask, why only minor adjustments can be considered and why not major ones also? That is because major ones have been considered and decided by the Parliament and the S. R. Commission. There may be some difficulties here and there of an administrative type. Only adjustments to meet such difficulties can be effected with the consent of the parties concerned. Hence the word 'minor' is put in. Whether the change is major or minor, agreement is the very essence and the very life of the proposed adjustments. No doubt, the Parliament is supreme but let us think what would happen if any arrangement is imposed from above

either by Parliament or by Government. The whole of India will be full of boundary disputes. That would mean the sowing of wind and they would reap the whirlwind. One of the Ministers of Orissa thought it fit to make a claim upon Bihar and similar claims are not uncommon. Therefore pure and simple agreement should be insisted upon without which not an inch of land from either side should be transferred.

My friend Sri M. C. Narasimhan wanted to know about Kasargod and other places. The answer is there. If there is agreement between the Kerala Government and this Government, we can have it. We cannot follow one principle here and other in another case. If we want Kasargod the position is unless we persuade the Kerala Government to an agreement, we cannot have it. If they do not come to an agreement, in the interest of the unity and integrity of India, we should not think of it. That principle applies to all. There is scope for minor adjustments.

In para 2 of the resolution, there is reference to certain activities, inspired and supported by our friends in the Bombay State. When they started Satyagraha in Chikodi taluk, a very large number of people came from outside. Rich traders sent out mercenary persons from Nipani. Even ladies were sent out. Some of them were poor Harijans and a very substantial number of people came from outside and they were hirelings.

Sri V. S. PATIL (Belgaum I).—May I know from the Hon'ble Member the number of Satyagrahis?

Sri S. D. KOTHAVALA.—The authorities arrested those persons and later released them as they thought that those persons were after all poor people and had come from other places. Soon after they were released the same people again launched Satyagraha and that is the reason why it is said that there were 18,000 persons. There is no question of thousands at all. The increase is only because of the repeated performance of those people. So far as Chikodi taluka is concerned, I know that revenue is being very willingly

paid. I know that certain villagers have decided to come out in a procession and pay the assessment.

The persons in authority in Bombay have acted in a wrong manner. If the paper reports are to be believed certain responsible ministers while touring the border areas of Bombay have made speeches instigating such unlawful activities. The Chief Minister of Bombay, as reported in the papers, lodged a protest with the Union Government when the police had to resort to lathi charges for the purpose of maintaining law and order. I do not understand the meaning of that. Without knowing the facts and relying on some friends' information, the Chief Minister has lodged a protest with the Union Government. Yesterday we read in papers—and I think the report is correct—that while the D.S.P. and the Deputy Commissioner were returning from Khanapur they were fired at by certain hooligans. Fortunately they escaped. Therefore, the second part of the resolution is very clear. The Mysore Government deserves congratulations. In this case they have acted with great restraint. No responsible Minister of this State has acted or told things of the type delivered by some of the Ministers of Bombay. Similarly nobody from Mysore is doing anything to foment trouble in Kannada areas of Bombay State because we know that the interest of India requires that we should follow the method of negotiation and agreement.

I lend my hearty support to this resolution.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The House will now rise and meet after half an hour.

The House adjourned for recess at Three of the Clock and re-assembled at Thirty Minutes past Three of the Clock.

[**Mr. SPEAKER** in the Chair.]

Sri B. R. SUNTHANKAR (Belgaum I).—**Mr. Speaker** Sir, I have closely

followed the speeches of the Hon'ble Members **Sri Nijalingappa** and the incorrigible Hon'ble **Sri Kothavale**.

Sri C. M. ARUMUGHAM (Kolar Gold Fields).—I take objection, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER.—**Sri Kothavale** is not here to take objection.

Sri B. R. SUNTHANKAR.—I regret to note that the Hon'ble Member **Sri Nijalingappa** has twisted facts and history also. And my Hon'ble friend **Sri Kothavale** has made mis-statements—a number of mis-statements. I will therefore deal first with the points mentioned by the Hon'ble Member **Sri Kothavale**.

Sri C. M. ARUMUGHAM.—Sir, where are the other Ministers? Is it that the 'Deputy Minister' includes Ministers or 'Minister' includes Deputy Ministers?

Mr. SPEAKER.—'Minister' includes a Deputy Minister. The Deputy Minister represents a Minister.

Sri B. BASAVALINGAPPA (Deputy Minister for Home).—Sir, in law, HE includes SHE.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—Sir, the border issue is very important and when such an important discussion is going on, we find the entire treasury benches empty. I do not know whether they have any fear from this side or that.

Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA (Ramana-garam).—Sir, since this is a border question, the Minister who is on the border of this Ministry is present. (*Laughter*).

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—Sir, I want to know whether the Deputy Minister is the entire Government or a part of it. You are the learned Speaker of this House Sir. You know this much better than myself. In the absence of the Members of the Treasury Benches, can one Deputy Minister represent the entire Government?

Mr. SPEAKER.—I have already said that the Hon'ble Ministers have gone to the Upper House and the Hon'ble Deputy Minister here represents the Ministers.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—It is not a question of representation in law. Even in the Budget debate, it has happened many a time that the Ministers are absent. When some points are made, at the end we find that no answers are given. Every time we have to interfere. To avoid such things, why not the Chief Minister or the Minister who is going to reply, if there is a reply, be present? Why should he not be here? After all the mover of the Resolution has taken pains to sit right through. There is no reason why the Chief Minister should not be here.

Mr. SPEAKER.—As I have already said, some of the Ministers are absent. I will ascertain.

Sri B. BASAVALINGAPPA.—I have sent for them, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER.—He has sent for them. In the meanwhile let us go on. If some of the points are not answered, they may be raised at the end. If no reply is forthcoming, what can be done?

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—You are soft to the other side.

Mr. SPEAKER.—If I am soft, I have been soft to all, especially to Sri Muckannappa. He may find out from the records, whether I am soft to him or not.

Sri B. R. SUNTHANKAR.—Sir, Hon'ble Sri Kothavale has made a number of mis-statements. Mere making mis-statements does not prove his case. I will deal with some of his points first. He complains that there are more disputes than the States that have been created. When disputes have once been created, they have got to be solved. Going back to unitary form of Government as suggested by him is not settling the matter. It is an escape. It is a sort of escapism on the part of Hon'ble Sri Kothavale.

Then he referred to the basis on which the States Re-organisation Commission recommended the formation of Karnatak State. The sole consideration for the S.R.C., I submit Sir, was the unification of the Kannad areas. That

was the aim with which they recommended the formation of Karnatak. I will quote from their report—page 100.

“It is not, therefore, only northern Karnataka which may hope to benefit from the unification of the two *Kannada speaking areas* north and south of the Tungabhadra.”

Please mark the words “*Kannad speaking areas* north and south of Tungabhadra.” It is clearly made what Karnatak area means—it was based on linguistic basis. Language was taken as the main basis.

Then, Sir, about Karwar, he put forth the plea that Karwar was built up only as a district place. That is not a fact. There was a place called Kadwad. In 1861, it was made a district place, Karwar being purely Konkani and Marathi, Kannad knowing clerks for the Collector's and other offices were not available in Karwar. So they had to be imported from Mangalore. That was the real situation. There were no Kannada speaking people available to serve in the Collectorate.

Sri B. VAIKUNTA BALIGA (Mangalore I).—May I know who were the clerks that were imported from Mangalore? On the other hand, may I inform the House that South Kanara and Karwar were bifurcated later?

Sri B. R. SUNTHANKAR.—They were brought from Mangalore. You will find this in the Kanara Gazetteer.

Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA.—By appearance, even Sri Sunthankar seems to have come from Mangalore.

Sri B. R. SUNTHANKAR.—I do not come from Mangalore.

Mr. SPEAKER.—From Goa, I suppose.

Sri B. R. SUNTHANKAR.—No.

Mr. SPEAKER.—From Konkan.

Sri B. R. SUNTHANKAR.—Yes.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Goa is Konkan.

Sri B. R. SUNTHANKAR.—Goa's question is a different case.

Then Sri Kothavale traced through history and said that Belgaum was part of Bellary District. It was natural because the Britishers first conquered Bellary. From Bellary that went

upwards and came to Belgaum. In 1818 they conquered Belgaum. Then Belgaum was under the Peshwas and Mahrattas. It was the Mahrattas who fought with the Britishers till the last. And Belgaum fort, we are proud to say, was fought by the Mahrattas continuously for three weeks before they yielded to the Britishers. At that time the British headquarters was at Bellary. That was why at that time, 140 years ago, Belgaum was made part of Bellary and then formed into district headquarters by the British Government.

Then Sri Kothavale spoke about the Malnad tract. His fear is if Belgaum and Karwar were taken away from Mysore, the Malnad area would be disrupted. But he conveniently forgets that Chandgad taluk which was a part of Belgaum has been now given over to Kolhapur-Bombay; Chandgad taluk is wholly Malnad. Malnad is not restricted to Mysore only. All the eastern slopes of the transitory region, i.e., the tract on the eastern slopes of Sahyadri is Malnad. In Mysore it is called Malnad and in Maharashtra it is called Maval. The Maval tract runs right through from North and South Saurashtra to Karwar, Belgaum and Khanapur and these areas are a continuation of it. Topographically and geographically, they belong to Maharashtra.

Sri Kothavale referred to Goa. He said that the fate of Goa should be decided by the Goan people. We also say the same thing. Goans should decide their own fate. There should be self-determination for every one. When you apply that principle to Goa, the same principle should be applied to the border area also. Let us decide our own fate. If the right is given to Goa, the same right must be given to us. We should decide our own fate and we have already decided to go to Maharashtra.

Then Sir, Sri Kothavale cleverly gave some figures of Belgaum District. He said that there are 51 per cent of Maharashtrian in Belgaum taluka and showed as if the remaining 49 per cent are Kannadigas. That is not true. In Belgaum taluk, the Marathis are 51 per cent and Kannada people are only

35 per cent. In Khanapur taluk, the Marathi speakers are 54 per cent and the Kannada speakers are only 34 per cent. Even if we take the Talukas of Belgaum and Khanapur, we are in a majority, and absolute majority, as for Chikodi, he gave figures that Marathi speakers are 42 per cent and Kannada speakers are 49 per cent. That is true according to 1951 Census but we are not claiming the whole Taluk. We are claiming contiguous areas in Chikodi Taluk and in those contiguous areas more than 70 per cent are Marathi-speaking and only 18 per cent Kannadigas.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—What is the number of villages?

Sri B. R. SUNTHANKAR.—44 villages which are contiguous to Kolhapur District. Then he said that Belgaum City was a cosmopolitan city. I submit Belgaum is not cosmopolitan in the sense that Bombay or Bangalore is. Belgaum has a distinct composition of population; Marathi speakers are 54 per cent and Kannada speakers are 24 per cent and Urdu or Hindi speaking population, mostly Muslims, is 15 per cent.

Sri D. DEVARAJ URS (Hunsur).—What about Sholapur?

Sri B. R. SUNTHANKAR.—The question of Sholapur does not arise here. Then, Sir, even in Belgaum there are about 15 per cent Muslims who are Urdu speakers. But their second language is Marathi. They use Marathi for every day purpose. All the Urdu schools in Belgaum City are Urdu-Marathi schools. Marathi is taught there as second language and there is not a single Urdu-Kannada school.

Sri S. D. KOTHAVALA.—In Belgaum, the affairs are managed by a small group.

Sri B. R. SUNTHANKAR.—That is what you are saying from beginning. Then Hon'ble Sri Kothavale congratulated Maharashtrians for getting Bombay back. I humbly submit that it was Hon'ble Kothavale while he was an M.L.A. in the former Bombay Assembly who was stoutly opposing the inclusion of Bombay in Maharashtra. Now after his coming over here, he is congratulating Maharashtrians. We accept his congratulations.

Sri S. D. KOTHAVALA.—It is not correct.

Sri B. R. SUNTHANKAR.—Then, Sir, he spoke about disruption of national unity. I fail to understand how unity is disrupted by one part going from this State to that State. High-sounding words are being used here saying that we are all Indians and we must be united. But I fail to understand how if Belgaum and the surrounding areas are transferred, the unity is going to be disrupted. On the contrary, it will establish more good-neighbourly relations and we will be more united among ourselves. Then he says the Bombay Government do not accept village as a unit. In the memorandum which is now a public document, submitted to the Zonal Council, the Bombay Government have insisted upon a well defined principle.

Sri B. D. JATTI (Chief Minister).—It is not a public document. It has been decided that it should be used very confidentially by the two Governments and it is not a public document.

Sri B. R. SUNTHANKAR.—The Bombay Government only three days back have placed this document at the disposal of the Bombay Assembly and it has become a public document.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—The Bombay Chief Minister has given so much information but our Chief Minister just keeps back the whole thing.

Sri B. R. SUNTHANKAR.—It is clearly stated in that memorandum that village is the only dependable unit because village is an organic unit and it is a dependable unit of habitation. These are the words used in that memorandum. So, they insist upon that being taken as the unit.

Sri Kothavale has again made the same allegation that we have been hiring persons as Satyagrahis. At the time of the last budget session, he made the same allegation and on the very floor of this House, I threw a challenge at him to prove the allegation. But he has failed to prove that. He is still persisting in the same allegation. 16,000 satyagrahis offered satyagraha in two satyagraha campaigns. Are they all hired? I would request the

Hon'ble Members of this House to form a committee to study the situation in the border area and let them go there and study the situation for themselves and place their report before this House. That is our earnest request.

Then Sir, I will come to Hon'ble Sri Nijalingappa's arguments. Sri Nijalingappa charged us that Belgaum was made the bone of contention by political parties, that parties were exploiting the situation and that people were trying to be heroes. But the real truth is, as rightly pointed out by my Hon'ble colleague Sri V. S. Patil, Belgaum is made the bone of contention by the political groups in the Congress Party here and not by us. These groups are exploiting the situation for their own interests and some Congress people are becoming heroes on the issue of Belgaum Town. Hon'ble Sri V. S. Patil has rightly said that Sri Nijalingappa has changed his opinion by quoting his speech on the 19th December 1956, when he was the Chief Minister of the State. May I remind the Hon'ble Sri Nijalingappa of his own words that he expressed to me? On two occasions he had expressed his opinion to me. The first occasion was 10th of August 1956. He was then a Member of the Lok Sabha. On the afternoon of 10th August, Lok Sabha had voted the States Reorganisation Bill and as soon as the voting was over and when Hon'ble Sri Nijalingappa came out of the House, I took the opportunity to meet him and appealed to him to find out a satisfactory solution to this border problem. In his usual kind manner he said there should be no difficulty and further he said "As far as Belgaum District is concerned take whatever is yours." These are his own words.

Sri S. NIJALINGAPPA (Molakalmuru).—I said so far as Belgaum question was concerned, I was willing for a compromise sitting across the table. I never said about Belgaum City. How can the City be divided? On the face of it, it is not correct.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Mr. Chavan has given credit to Ex-Chief Minister Sri Nijalingappa. Sri Chavan has explained that Sri Nijalingappa told him that

Belgaum and Karwar should not be claimed.

Sri B. R. SUNTHANKAR.—I am saying what the Hon'ble Member told me. He has said: "So far as Belgaum is concerned, you take what is yours; as far as Karwar is concerned, we want Karwar forest and we won't give you Karwar". Those were his words. I hope, I am not disclosing any secret. Then again I met him on 4th March 1958 when he was the Chief Minister of the State. I approached him on that day and again requested him to solve our problem as early as possible. These are his words. He said: "I can understand your claim about Belgaum. I have no objection about Belgaum". Then he hastened to tell me: "Please don't give it out particularly to the Press". These are the very words which he said to me. I had no mind to give it out.

4-00 P.M.

Mr. SPEAKER.—It is very dangerous to tread on such path. After all, private talks are not to be disclosed.

Sri B. VAIKUNTA BALIGA.—I rise to a point of order, Sir. Is it open to any member to say something about a matter which has been talked to him in private? I do not admit for a moment the correctness or otherwise of what he has mentioned. He agreed that it was something confidential and so will it be proper for a member to come forward and divulge it like this?

Mr. SPEAKER.—I have already said that private talks should not be made use of. It is not fair. After all, in this case the other Hon'ble Member is here to refute.

Sri B. R. SUNTHANKAR.—I am only making the point that Sri Nijalingappa is now changing his attitude and his words and that is due to the pressure of group politics in his own party.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA (Nanjan-gud).—He is directly making allegations against Sri Nijalingappa after the Chair has given a ruling.

Sri S. NIJALINGAPPA.—My friend is completely misinterpreting me. So

far as I am concerned, there is nothing public or private. Let him bring his representatives and I shall bring my representatives and we will settle it. He must have complained to me about a few areas and I told him I was willing to come to a compromise and settlement but I could never have told him that Belgaum City would be given to them or that Karwar would be given to them.

Sri B. R. SUNTHANKAR.—The Hon'ble Member Sri Nijalingappa has made an invention about the name of Belgaum. He said that Belgaum was a Kannad name. That is not true. The name 'Belgaum' is derived from 'Venu Grama,' which means a village of bamboos. Venu Gram became Velugram—Belugram and finally Belgaum. It is not a Kannad word at all. Similarly, his statement that Belgaum historically belongs to Karnatak is equally wrong and baseless. This is not the place to trace the history of Belgaum for the last 2,000 years. Throughout the history Belgaum has always been a part of Maharashtra. The dynasties that ruled over Belgaum were, to start from the very beginning, Shalivahanas, Rashtrakutas, Chalukyas, Kadambas, Shilahars, Yadavas of Devgiri. They were all Kshatriya dynasties. Then came the Bahmanis dynasties and Bijapur kingdom. The whole of Belgaum area was conquered by the great Shivaji. He had 36 forts in Belgaum tract. It was under Peshwas till 1818 when it was annexed by the British. So, on historical ground also Belgaum belongs to Maharashtra.

Sri K. HANUMANT HAIYA.—I would like to know from my Hon'ble friend whether Shivaji wanted to form a linguistic State of Maharashtra.

Sri B. R. SUNTHANKAR.—Then, he further said that Belgaum was the headquarters of the Southern Division in the Bombay State. The Southern Division did not include four districts only. The coastal districts of Ratnagiri and Kolaba were included in this Division. They are Marathi districts. Later on, the Kolhapur District was also added to this Division. It was because Belgaum was a Marathi Centre

(SRI B. R. SUNTHANKAR)

that it was made the Divisional headquarters of these Marathi Districts.

His next argument is that Belgaum is the headquarters of the district and so how can it go? This is strange logic! He wants Belgaum because it is the district place. He wants Nipani because it is a commercial town and he wants Karwar because it is a port! This is a fine piece of logic. This is nothing but sheer selfishness, narrow-mindedness and parochialism of a bad type.

As a matter of fact, the whole problem centres round the Belgaum Town. It is a Maharashtrian town in all senses and from all points of view. All the factors—language, culture, literature, art, tradition, trade and commerce, relations and affiliations—all go to prove that it is a part of Maharashtra. Linguistic composition is distinctly Marathi. 54 per cent is Marathi and 24 per cent is Kannad. The rest are mostly speakers of other languages, mostly Urdu and Hindi. The second language of Urdu speakers is Marathi only. I have already said that all the Urdu schools are Urdu-Marathi and there is not a single Urdu-Kannad school. Taking this into consideration, the percentage of Marathi-speaking people comes to nearly 75 per cent.

There is a misunderstanding that Belgaum Town is surrounded by Kannad villages. This is not a fact. Belgaum is not an island in Kannada area. It is surrounded by Marathi villages. To the west it is surrounded by purely Marathi villages and to the east the Marathi area extends 8 miles up to the Sambre Aerodrome. Belgaum Town is only 7 miles from the Mysore Border. Beyond that is Chandgad Taluka which was a part of Belgaum District till the Reorganisation. But now it is given to Kolhapur District. Areas now included in Mysore are similar to the area of Chandgad. When Chandgad has been given to Maharashtra, why not these areas also?

Now I turn to the Belgaum Municipality. This body is 108 years old. Since the start its official language is

Marathi and its records are maintained in Marathi. More than three-fourths of its members have always been Marathi speakers.

It is often wrongly contended that Belgaum has greater trade with Karnataka. This is not true. It can be easily proved that the greater volume of trade of Belgaum, *i.e.*, nearly 80 per cent is with Maharashtra area and particularly with the coastal district of Ratnagiri. I have ample statistics to prove this but I do not wish to take the time of the House by going into details now. Belgaum town is a marketing centre for the whole of southern portion of Ratnagiri District. The findings of the S.R.C. in this respect are not correct. To say that Belgaum is a transit trade centre in cotton and groundnut is not a correct statement. It is wrong. There are eight to ten regulated markets in the district and their trade figures may be looked into. It can be seen from the octroi collected by the Belgaum Municipality that out of total collection of 15 lakhs only a sum of Rs. 150 is collected on cotton and cotton seeds.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Then what is the main trade of Belgaum if it is not cotton and oil seeds?

Sri B. R. SUNTHANKAR.—It is paddy and rice,—jaggery and sweet potatoes. Belgaum supplies paddy to the whole coastal district of Ratnagiri.

In one of our memoranda submitted to the Central Government and to the members of Parliament we have expressed our apprehension that if Belgaum is included in Karnataka its trade would heavily suffer. I would read that particular extract:

“By thrusting Belgaum into the Mysore State, Government will not only succeed in disrupting the economy of South Konkan but it would also be dealing a death blow to the commercial community of Belgaum.”

These apprehensions have come true. The trade of Belgaum is heavily suffering and it is reduced to half and even more. On account of Zonal restrictions and on account of State restrictions,

incidence of sales tax and so many other factors, all the natural markets for Belgaum like Kolhapur, Sangli, Poona, South Ratnagiri which are in Bombay State, are now blocked and Belgaum is losing its trade. It is diverted elsewhere. So, Belgaum is suffering in respect of trade and commerce and that can be seen from the figures of income tax and other records.

[SRI R. G. KAMAT in the Chair.]

The case of Bellary is similar to that of Belgaum. The States Reorganisation Commission have said on page 98 :

“ We have recommended earlier that the Ballary town, along with the Pellary taluk, should go to Andhra, although the town, according to Sri Justice Misra's report did not have a predominantly Andhra complexion; our recommendation in respect of the Belgaum town follows the same principles.”

According to the States Reorganisation Commission Bellary was to go to Andhra. Now it has come to Mysore. On the same basis Belgaum should go to Maharashtra. The case of Belgaum is even stronger than that of Bellary because in Bellary the Kannada speakers are in a minority but in Belgaum Marathi speakers are in an absolute majority.

I will now turn to the disputed point of Konkani. Hon'ble Sri S. Nijalingappa took great pains to prove that Konkani was not Marathi. But his efforts are in vain. He quoted Sri Kaka Kalelkar to show that Konkani is independent of Marathi. Kaka Kalelkar may be a scholar of Gujarati but certainly he is not a philologist. Even Kaka Kalelkar would never say that Konkani is akin to Kannada. He admits that Konkani is the nearest language to Marathi. He has written and published it. Konkani is recognised as a 'spoken form' or dialect of Marathi by eminent scholars like Dr. Grierson, Dr. Bhandarkar, Mahamahopadhyaya P. V. Kane. Now made the National Professor—, Principal R. N. Welinkar of the Elphinston College, Bombay, Professor A. K. Priyolkar, Director of Marathi Research

Institute, Bombay. Almost all of them are speakers of Konkani. About 30 years back eminent Konkani scholars sat together, held discussions and came to the conclusion that Konkani is a dialect of Marathi. They published a memorandum which anybody can see. In that memorandum they have clearly said that Konkani is a dialect of Marathi.

The Government's Census report of the North Kanara District upto 1911 shows only Marathi population which includes Konkanis also. In the later Census report however the Konkanis were mentioned separate but they were classified under the head 'Marathi and dialects'. That shows clearly that the Government accepted Konkani as a dialect of Marathi. The Bombay Government also accepted Konkani as a dialect of Marathi and recognised Marathi as regional language of Karwar, Supa and Haliyal.

Sri G. B. SHANKAR RAO (Hirekerur).—Which Government accepted Konkani as a dialect of Marathi?

Sri B. R. SUNTHANKAR.—The Bombay Government which was a Congress Government consisting of Gujaratis, Maharashtrians and Kannadigas. The Gujaratis and Kannadigas joined together to turn the Maharashtrians into a minority.

All girls' schools in Karwar, Supa and Haliyal are invariably Marathi schools because they use Marathi for reading and writing at home. To quote one more example, in 1947 Karnatak Women's Conference was held at Karwar. All the speeches and proceedings of that conference were conducted in Marathi because the women of Karwar could not understand a word of Kannada. Still further, that conference passed a resolution asking for inclusion of Karwar, Supa and Haliyal in Maharashtra.

That resolution was passed at that Karnatak women's conference. What more proof is required? Bombay Government had already accepted Konkani as a dialect of Marathi. Goa Konkani is similar to Karwar Konkani. Goa people have adopted Marathi as their written language since the beginning. As long back as 15th

(SRI B. R. SUNTHANKAR)

century, a Christian Priest Father Stephen composed Christian Puran in Marathi and that is one of the masterpieces of Marathi poetry. This should be taken into consideration. Similarly Goa and Karwar areas have contributed a good number of Marathi authors and poets to Marathi literature. Of the 243 Primary Schools in Goa, all are Marathi and there is not a single Kannada school. These all go to prove that Konkani is undoubtedly a dialect of Marathi. Hon'ble Sri Nijalingappa gave certain figures. But he conveniently forgot to mention the figures of Kannad speakers in the three taluks. In Supa Petha, according to 1951 Census, 85 per cent are Konkani-Marathi speakers and only 5 per cent are Kannada speakers. The whole of Supa Petha is purely Marathi-Konkani Taluk and only 5 per cent are Kannada speakers and they are mostly labourers working in the mines migrated from Kannada areas. Then take Karwar Taluk. There 78 per cent of the population is Konkani-Marathi and only 15 per cent Kannada. Let us take Karwar town. There 63 per cent Konkani-Marathi and only 28 per cent Kannada speaking people. Then take Haliyal Taluk which is the taluk of the Hon'ble Chairman. There are about 60 per cent Konkani-Marathi speaking people ; it is clearly a Marathi area and only 22 per cent are Kannada-speakers.

In the amendment that we have tabled we have given an approach to the problem. What we urge is that border problem should be solved on the basis of well-recognised principles. These principles are contiguity, village as unit, linguistic majority and the wishes of the people. These are the criteria on which the problem of the border should be settled. These criteria should be applied to the Marathi areas in the State as well as, I submit, they should be applied to the Kannada areas in the adjoining States. Because the contiguous Kannada areas that are now joined to the neighbouring States ought also to come over to the State. Instead of adopting these well-recognised

principles, the motion that is before us seeks for minor adjustments. Thereby a distinction is sought to be made between major issues and minor issues, major disputes and minor disputes. I submit, Sir, a dispute is after all a dispute, whether it is minor or major and it has got to be solved. By calling a dispute a major dispute, it does not cease to exist. On the contrary it requires urgent solution. It is really a strange way of thinking that it should be suggested that these disputed points should be left out only because they are major. I fail to understand the logic of the argument.

Then, Sir, we are claiming for Maharashtra, as I have already stated, contiguous Marathi areas ; in all, they comprise of 814 villages with a total population of nearly 7 lakhs and these areas are spread in the districts of Belgaum, Karwar and Bidar. This is not a small area ; it is of the size of a district. These areas are part and parcel of Maharashtra, That is our claim. I have already given figures about Karwar District and Belgaum District. In the Belgaum District, we claim only the western portion which is predominantly Marathi and which is contiguous to Bombay State. In Belgaum District, Sir, I submit that linguistic homogeneity is clear-cut. Kannada areas and Marathi areas can be easily demarcated without any difficulty. That is no promiscuous inter-mingling of populations speaking these two languages. There is ample statistical data with me. I will only give relevant percentages. As I have already said, in Chikodi Taluk, we claim Nipani area. In this area about 44 villages are Marathi speaking areas and in that area 72 per cent are Marathi speakers and only 19 per cent Kannada speakers ; in Belgaum Taluk, in the area we claim, the contiguous Marathi area has 60 per cent Marathi speakers and 23 per cent Kannada speakers. In Khanapur Taluk, the area we claim has got 76 per cent Marathi speakers and only 11 per cent Kannada speakers. Taken together, the whole Marathi population of Marathi area in Belgaum District is about 70 per cent and Kannada

speakers are only 20 per cent. That is according to the census figures of 1951. In Karwar District in 3 taluks that we claim, Marathi-Konkani speakers taken together are 73 per cent while Kannada speakers are only 16 per cent. That is the linguistic composition of Marathi areas we claim for Maharashtra.

Then I will come to the point of minorities. It is contended that there are bound to be minorities in every State. It is true, but our case is not like that of other minorities being scattered here and there. Our case is quite different. Our case is a case of majority artificially turned into a minority. 70 per cent of the population in the areas that we claim are Marathi speakers and it is an overwhelming majority but by reorganisation of the States, this overwhelming majority has been turned into an insignificant and ineffective minority. In the whole State they are not even $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. From 70 per cent, we have come down to $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent.

4-30 P.M.

This minority Sir, I submit, has suffered severe handicaps in all fields—in administration, employment, education and various other fields. There will be ample opportunity for us during the Budget session when I will have to make references to them in particular. What we say is that the best way is to reduce the minority to the minimum on both sides—Mysore State as well as Bombay State,—so that such vexed problems need not arise. In Belgaum District all these readjustments suggested by us, would affect about 3 lakhs of Marathi people who will go to Maharashtra and still $1\frac{1}{2}$ lakhs of Marathi people will have to remain in Mysore, because they are in the remaining part of the Belgaum district.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—Even in Bangalore also there are Marathies.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—How will they fight for linguistic rights?

Sri B. R. SUNTHANKAR.—We will leave them to you.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—He wants to get away and leave these people to your care.

Sri B. R. SUNTHANKAR.—Only about 85,000 Kannadigas will have to go to Maharashtra. And if this Government comes to an agreement with the Bombay State, they will get Kannada population of about 3 lakhs in south Sholapur, Akkalkot, etc.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—You say that if this Government can come to some agreement with Bombay State, then these Kannada areas will come. Not otherwise. Why do you make it subject to the agreement with Bombay Government?

Sri B. R. SUNTHANKAR.—I submit Sir, the Bombay Government in their memorandum have shown their willingness and they are willing to transfer that Kannada population at any time. But this Government stands in the way.

Sir, this problem should be looked at from the point of view of maximum convenience of the people also. The convenience of the people should get a high priority in any consideration, more than administrative or other consideration. The Maharashtrians of Belgaum, Karwar and other areas feel it most convenient to go to Maharashtra; nothing else would satisfy them.

Then Sir, the last factor is that the wishes of the people should be taken into consideration. Five lakhs of people have shown, have demonstrated clearly in unequivocal terms their wishes and desires, in a number of ways, in all possible democratic ways, by demonstrations, meetings and hartals by deputations, by resolutions of the local bodies, bye-election, general elections and so on. We ourselves are here in this Assembly by the verdict and mandate of the people. There has been satyagraha thrice in which 16,000 people participated; 8 people died for this cause, five in the police firing and three in the Jail.

Then Sir, as the Hon'ble Member Sri V. S. Patil has put it, we are willing to have a plebiscite. Take a plebiscite. We are willing to undergo any test. I submit to the House Sir, on this issue, our people are willing to undergo any test. Take a plebiscite. We are ready.

Sri M. MALLIKARJUNASWAMY (Malavalli).—May I know from the Hon'ble Member whether there is any provision in the Constitution for taking a plebiscite ?

Sri B. R. SUNTHANKAR.—I am not speaking of the Constitution. I am saying that we are prepared to face any test.

Sri M. MALLIKARJUNASWAMY.—In the States Reorganisation Act is there any provision, I would like to know.

Sri B. R. SUNTHANKAR.—Before closing Sir, I would like to make one or two points clear.

There seems to be a great misunderstanding in the minds of some Hon'ble Members about our way of approach.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—We have no misunderstanding. We have understood correctly.

Sri B. R. SUNTHANKAR.—I wish to make use of this opportunity to say to this Hon'ble House that our agitation is fully democratic and peaceful. We want peaceful agitation. That is why we resorted to satyagraha. As my Hon'ble colleague Sri V. S. Patil has already said, this No Tax campaign is also an extended form of satyagraha. We want to conduct it in that way. We did not want and we never countenanced and we will never countenance or encourage rowdism and goondaism or violence. There was unfortunately an incident near Belgaum that was referred to by my friend. We condemn those acts of violence and I take this opportunity in this House to condemn all acts of violence. We will never encourage or sponsor such violent activities. We want to achieve our goal by democratic and peaceful means because we have got full faith in democracy and democratic principles.

Well, Sir, I have taken much time of the House. One point I would refer to. In the motion, there is a very sinister word which I do not like—people coming from Maharashtra are treated as outsiders. Sir, we are all subject to the national unity. After all this agitation is in relation to the redrawing of the boundaries between Maharashtra and Karnataka—two units of the same

National State of India. Are boundaries between Maharashtra and Karnataka like frontiers between two independent National States ? Is it a case of Pakistan or Hindustan or is it a case of China and India ?

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—That is what you want to create.

Sri B. R. SUNTHANKAR.—No Sir. In that way, people from outside the State are bound to come here. Do not Congressmen call their leaders from outside the State ? Do they not invite to this State the Hon'ble Prime Minister, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru who comes from Uttar Pradesh ? Do they also call him as an outsider ?

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Fine interpretation !

Sri B. R. SUNTHANKAR.—You are not accepting the logic of the term. Why should you call our Maharashtrian leaders as outsiders here ? Can we say that in our own area this Mysore Government is an outsider ? Can we say like that ? You are treating Maharashtrians as outsiders as if they come from Pakistan, as if they have come from China or Russia. Is it the way of approach ? Is it a correct way ? We do not consider our Kannada brothers as outsiders. If people from Mysore, say, members of Karnatak Border Action Committee, go to the Kannad speaking people in South Satara, Sholapur, and Akkalkot, we Maharashtrians will not call them as outsiders. We are all Indians : we are like two brothers and we shall look at it from that view-point. Therefore, Sir this term ' outsiders ' is a very sinister word.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Why did you not send an amendment ?

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—What is the part of the Belgaum District that you want ?

Sri B. R. SUNTHANKAR.—The Hon'ble Member has not heard me properly I think. We are claiming the western portion of the Belgaum district which is contiguous to Maharashtra, i.e., Kolhapur and Rathnagiri Districts.

Mr. CHAIRMAN.—Please do not repeat.

Sri B. R. SUNTHANKAR.—Lastly, Sir, I would earnestly appeal to the Hon'ble Members of this House to consider this question dispassionately. We are expecting justice and fairness from this House and from the Government. What we want is justice and fairplay. So before closing, Sir, I earnestly appeal to all the Hon'ble Members of this House and to the Government to consider our question dispassionately and in a rational way and to give us justice and fairness. We are asking for justice and nothing but justice.

Thank you, Sir.

†**Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA** (Nanjangud).—Mr Speaker, Sir, I have very carefully and with very great interest listened to the speeches made on the floor of this Hon'ble House on this important question. I must first congratulate Sri Veeranna Gowdh and Sri Nijalingappa on the very convincing manner in which they have placed the case of Mysore on this border issue. I am sorry that any Hon'ble Member should attribute motives to anybody. This question has become or assumed added importance, more especially after the official resolution was passed on the floor of the Legislative Assembly of Bombay.

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair]

It has now become rather ticklish in its character. The motion as it was placed before this Hon'ble House on Friday, the 11th, did not assume that importance till that official resolution was passed in Bombay. It is against this context I expect or expected Hon'ble Members to handle this thing in an objective manner and in a spirit of understanding, goodwill and accommodation and with a desire to see things from the point of view of larger interests of not only Bombay or Mysore but of the country as a whole. Even now I would appeal to the Hon'ble Members who will speak after me to bear this in mind. It is not an issue which exclusively relates to any political party. It is a State issue, Mysore as a whole. I want the Hon'ble Members to remember this.

The Chief Minister of Bombay stated unnecessarily that the Chief Minister of Mysore was treating this as a prestige issue. I wish the Chief Minister of Bombay had not said it. It is not a prestige issue at all for any State. At any rate I wish to assure the Hon'ble Members of this House that this is not our approach to this problem. It is definitely not a personal matter between the Chief Minister of Bombay and the Chief Minister of Mysore. It has now become a live issue for the re-organisation of the State and those concerned with the territorial integrity of the Mysore State. It is unfortunate—whoever is responsible—that such a situation should have been created or that this situation should have been precipitated by a set of people that do not belong to Mysore or apparently belong to Mysore and Bombay, and we have to discuss this matter once again on the floors of the Legislative Assembly and Council. I am very happy that the Upper House has taken a unanimous decision on this issue. It is not very difficult to anticipate the verdict of this House because on previous occasions, where it concerned the welfare of the whole State of Mysore, whether under Government auspices or in the private sector, the Hon'ble Members of this House have always developed an attitude of intense patriotism. They have been very fair. They have been very just. They have tackled the problem in a spirit of understanding and when it affected the State approached it in a realistic manner. So I am confident that we will get through this motion in a spirit of tranquillity and calm understanding and goodwill, and in an atmosphere which is very necessary for a solution of this problem, ceaselessly pledging ourselves for a united, prosperous and strong Mysore State, I do not want any other considerations to come into the picture. I see from one or two speeches, both on the side of the Opposition and on the side of the ruling party, provocative references being made. I do not want such things. It is better, having regard to the traditions of this House, that we should

(SRI J. B. MALLARADHYA)

approach this problem in a spirit of goodwill.

I consider that this border issue should have been closed once and for all. I wish to invite the attention of the Hon'ble Members to the States Re-organisation Act of 1956, and ask whether any Hon'ble Member will show any section under this Act where there is scope for re-opening this issue which has been conclusively settled once for all. There is no section, except section 21, to which I will come later. Many references were made to the S.R.C. Report. I heard a lot which has been attributed to the S.R.C. members. It should not be forgotten that every effort was made by the Fazl Ali Commission to get a cross-section of public opinion, not merely in the Mysore State or Bombay State but in all the States of India. A number of people were associated, a number of public organisations were associated with it. Journalists, members of Assemblies, members of Parliament, members of various municipalities and district boards, people interested in cultural, linguistic and social activities of the entire country were consulted and thus the entire public opinion was ascertained. I do not think there was any Commission set up by the Government either at the Centre or at the State level, which took credit for doing such vast work. It is stated that a lakh and fifty-two thousand communications or documents were examined by the Commission. More than 2,000 memoranda have been looked into. If I remember correctly, nine thousand people have been interviewed. That is the report I read. It is as a result of those recommendations that the matter was considered at the Parliament and in the States and a final decision was taken. I should like to ask where is the scope for re-opening the issue after the Parliament has come to a final decision. I really cannot understand it. Sir, the S. R. Commission really tried to understand the background of this problem and the sentiment of the people affected by the proposed re-organisation. In

addition to the large volume of evidence, both oral and documentary placed before them, they relied on official documents and the Census Reports. Sri Sunthankar and Sri Patil have referred to these official documents and an argument was advanced by them in regard to these census figures. It is true that they did not have the mother-tongue figures either on talukawise basis or villagewise basis. They have not furnished them for the simple reason that the Bombay Government Census Department had not compiled those figures. The only figures available were tractwise figures.

† Sri B. R. SUNTHANKAR.—When the States Re-organization Commission came to Belgaum, the Belgaum Municipality had supplied to the Commission these linguistic figures, because it was the Belgaum Municipality that had taken the census. They had given clear figures to the States Re-organization Commission.

† Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Sir, I am afraid that my Hon'ble friend seems to forget one thing. Even if the Belgaum Municipality had furnished figures, they could never be taken as authoritative, because they are not authorised. The authority is only the Registrar General and the Census Commissioner of India. I was giving evidence before Justice Wanchu. When this question of re-organisation was a live issue, I have met Pandit Kunzru and Mr. Pannikar. As the Census Commissioner, I have compiled census figures. The figures compiled by the Municipality of Belgaum cannot be taken as authoritative. It is true that the Municipality was the agency. But unless and until they were incorporated in the official census documents, they cannot be relied upon. When I say that census figures tractwise were placed before them, it is not correct to say that the Municipality furnished the census figures.

Sri B. R. SUNTHANKAR.—The Census Department also gave the figures to the Commission.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—I am telling him that they will rely, in addition to the large volume of oral and

documentary evidence, on the official reports and the census figures. The census figures are the most important thing and unless they are in the printed report with the seal and authority of the State Government and the Central Government they cannot be relied upon.

The whole agitation seems to have been started relying too much on the linguistic principle. With the leave of the Speaker I would like to refer to the historical documents connected with the linguistic principle. I know that this is a long-exploded theory. Between the years 1927 and 1947 for a full period of 20 years I think it is the Congress and the Congress Organisation which displayed an attitude of unqualified adherence to the linguistic principle. The mischief that has come up is all due to the Congress. This was actually started by the Congress in their freedom struggle. In this connection, I would like to refer to three instances. One was the Calcutta session in October 1937 in which they recommended for the first time the formation of Andhra and Karnatak States on linguistic basis. Next, by a resolution of the Working Committee of the Congress in 1938 held in Wardha they gave an assurance to the deputations from Kerala, Andhra and Karnataka that as soon as they assumed power and as soon as they were in a position to give expression to their wishes they would implement it. Again, in their election manifesto of 1945-46 they reiterated their adherence, their belief and their faith in the linguistic principle. Actually, they swore by it over a period of 20 years. The credit must go to Pandit Nehru who has been quoted on the floor of the House for making a speech after the attainment of independence before the Constituent Assembly. For the first time in the history of the Congress movement in India they gave a go-by in a sense to this purely linguistic principle. This is what he said in the Constituent Assembly: "First things must come first and the first thing is the security and the stability of India." Continuing this there was a reference in his speech to the linguistic and cultural basis as the determining factors for reorganisation. Then came, as you are all aware, the Dhar Commission set

up in December 1948. They presented a report which gives the go-by to these theories advanced by my Maharashtrian friends about the linguistic principle. They said that the emphasis should be mainly on administrative convenience and they have also held the view that any emphasis exclusively or mainly on the linguistic principle would be thoroughly inadvisable and would lead to dangerous consequences. Then, the Chief Minister of Bombay has more or less raised the question of language homogeneity. The Dhar Commission says that homogeneity of language should enter into the picture only as a matter of administrative convenience or expediency. One other important matter that the Dhar Commission has said was that every aspect of reorganisation which helped the growth of nationalism has to be fostered and everything which impeded or hampered it should be ignored or should lie over. My Hon'ble friend Sri Kothavale talked about the historical, geographical, economical and cultural considerations. The Dhar Commission said that all these considerations should always be subordinated to national unity and solidarity. It will be within the memory of members that the Indian National Congress appointed in December 1948 a committee known as the J. V. P. Committee consisting of Jawaharlal Nehru, the late Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel and the late Dr. Pattabhi Seetharamaiah. This particular report was of great value coming as it did after the attainment of independence and this report was adopted in toto in April 1949 by the Working Committee of the Congress in the Jaipur Session. They sounded a note of warning, notably Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, against this linguistic formation of States. They said, "Language is no doubt a binding force and it could be a potential force for dividing people, for separating them and permanently keeping them apart" and they said that every separatist and disruptionist tendency should be vigorously discouraged and that this linguistic principle should not create serious administrative dislocations or mutual conflicts which would jeopardise the political and

(SRI J. B. MALLARADHYA)

economic stability of the country. So, the 1951 All-India Congress Resolution, the Congress manifesto of 1951, the Hyderabad session of 1953 and the Kalyani Session of the Congress in 1954—all this re-affirmed the faith of the Government in the content of the J. V. P. report which gave the go-by to this linguistic principle. The S. R. Commission said that it would not be realistic to consider any case for redistribution on a single test alone and that is what they have done. The totality of circumstances and overall assessment of the problem was what was proposed by them and they thoroughly condemned all previous commissions including the S. R. C.

In this connection, I should like to briefly refer to what is happening in foreign countries. It is only in two countries in the world today, namely, U. S. S. R. and Yugoslavia where efforts have been made to have units on a linguistic basis. Even in those countries I believe there are constitutional and extra-constitutional and ideological correctives which can always be requisitioned for service if any regional loyalties are likely to conflict with national interest. We should not forget that both in Eastern and Western Europe the multi-lingual States had to face serious disruption because of the language difficulty. We must remember that Belgium and Spain are classic examples. In Spain when divided loyalty and divided sympathy for Germany and France came in, the Swiss neutrality was seriously jeopardised in the last Great war. Therefore, we should profit not only by the experience of our own country but also of other countries. It should not be forgotten in this context that Indian unity is a plant of very recent origin and it should be nurtured, watered and taken care of and protected against all kinds of inroads, against this inimical attitude, against this unfriendly attitude and against this disruptionist and fissiparous tendency. Indian nationalism has yet to develop as a positive concept and you cannot do that unless you assume an attitude of friendliness.

My Maharashtrian friends have been talking so much about agitation. In spite of the violent agitation, the Government of India have categorically stated on the floor of the Lok Sabha that the question of separating Vidarbha and constituting it into a separate State is out of question. Why they are not very clearcut in regard to the question of separating some areas from Mysore and joining them to Bombay? They have given a go-by to the Vidarbha business. We are reading from papers that there is a violent agitation in Vidarbha.

5 P.M.

Sir, when the Constituent Assembly discussed this question of Reorganisation of States, this concept of dual citizenship which is current in the United States of America was referred to by the late Sri Ambedkar and others. They stated that they were very firm in their mind that the idea of dual citizenship was out of place and not applicable under any circumstance in India. In the United States of America one can derive the advantage of being a citizen of a particular State and a citizen of the entire country. But, such a thing is unthinkable here. Here there is only the concept of single citizenship and we are all citizens of India whether we are in Mysore or Bombay or Maharashtra or anywhere else. This particular aspect should be remembered by my friend. Simply because one is a Maharashtrian or a Kaniadiga or any body else, he is not going to be deprived of the citizenship of India. That is a most important matter. The States Re-organisation Commission have very categorically stated on page 46 of the report that in matters relating to decisions that should be taken at the highest level, a balanced approach to this problem is very necessary. I think it would be very interesting if I read one or two extracts from this report. They said "A balanced approach would appear to be to repudiate the homeland concept which negates one of the fundamental principles of the Indian Constitution, namely, equal opportunities and equal rights for all citizens throughout the length and breadth

of the Union." "It is all right for our friends to say we would like to go to Maharashtra" but how can they say that a particular area should also go with them? It is all very well to say that you want to go to another State. But you are introducing into your agitation this homeland concept which has been severely criticised and condemned by those people who are responsible for the reorganisation of States. I do not want to read the entire extract but I would like to invite the attention of my friends to one matter. My friend Sri V. S. Patil for whom I have very great regard as a colleague of this House, has referred to the wishes of people in a democracy. No one in this House is going to minimise the importance of the role of the people in a democracy in shaping the destinies of a country. Even the Commissions, the J.V.P. Report, the Dhar Commission and so many other committees have all recognised that and they have given adequate recognition to the wishes of the people. But, my friends seem to forget one important factor that none of them concedes the principle of self-determination to any group without subjecting it to certain limitations. Supposing we had given an unbridled licence that the wish of the people is the only factor. Do you mean to say that the abolition of Princely States would have ever been an accomplished fact? I remember about the State of Sandur which talked so much of sovereignty. That State thought of sovereignty when even bigger States did not think so. Supposing that principle had been conceded, that is, the principle of self-determination, what would have happened? So, there is no point in arguing that way. If this principle is conceded, there will be as many States as there are Marathi speaking people. That is a fantastic thing.

Now I come to the question of Belgaum.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—All your arguments would have been all right if they had been made in Bombay.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—If Sri Y. B. Chavan is a man with ideas and wants to know how the public opinion

is shaping, he must take a copy of my speech and read it.

In regard to Khanapur and Belgaum including the city of Belgaum, it is true that they have closer affiliations with Maharashtra with 53.9 per cent and 54.4 per cent respectively. These are the figures culled from official reports and my friend Sri B. R. Sunthakar cannot dispute these facts. It should not be forgotten that all the taluks of Belgaum have economic relations with both Maharashtra and Kannada-speaking areas. My friend Sri B. R. Sunthakar tried to make out a picture that Belgaum had nothing to do with Kannada-speaking areas and as if the affiliation of the people of Belgaum was only with Maharashtrians. The entire trade of Belgaum is with both Kannada-speaking areas and Marathi-speaking areas. My friend said that Belgaum was not a centre of transit trade. He repudiated the suggestion made in the S.R.C. Report that it was a transit trade centre of cotton and oil seeds. I fail to understand this and I do not know where my friend got the figures. It is true that potatoes and paddy are grown there. But, I do not know how he can dispute the fact that the cotton and the oil seeds are the two major commercial crops grown there. Neither Belgaum nor any disputed area has any particularly marked economic affiliation with Bombay. That is a matter which my friend should consider. I have based the figures on official reports. Nobody has questioned the fact that in the town or city of Belgaum there are more people speaking Marathi. But, what is the history of its swelling in numbers? My friend Sri S. Nijalingappa said that there were only about 44,000 persons and it has now grown to 4 lakhs or so. How did it happen? Just as Bangalore population is increasing everyday, there also population has increased. When I drew up Census figures in 1951 the population in Bangalore was not even 5 lakhs and it is now 14 lakhs. The Hon'ble Chief Minister and the entire Cabinet were surprised to hear that Bangalore consisted of 23 per cent of Tamilians and that is the single largest

(SRI J. B. MALLARADHYA)

community. So, I am not at all surprised that in a city like Belgaum there may be more Marathi-speaking people. When nearly 10 to 11 taluks speaking other than Marathi are constituted into a separate district, can it be possible for Belgaum City to be separated and isolated and added on to Bombay? I cannot understand the logic of this.

The States Reorganisation Act of 1956 provides for safeguards of linguistic groups. I wish to invite the attention of my friend Sri Sunthakar and his friends to Art. 307 of the Constitution which provides adequate safeguards. There is clear guide to govern the use of different languages at different levels of administration. The Government of India have a responsibility in this matter. My friend referred to certain schools where Marathi language is being taught to Urdu people. I know a school where girls were prevented from learning Kannada. As an erstwhile officer of the Education Department, I know how the girls were prevented from learning Kannada. But, you cannot make that as an excuse and say that there is no Kannada at all. There is adequate protection given to minority interest. Well, Sir, coming to Press attacks, is there any new points urged by our Maharashtrian friends which was not urged before the S. R. Commission and Parliament? Did they not have representatives of Maharashtrians at Parliament level and at the Bombay Legislative Assembly level? Did they not give evidence before the S. R. Commission? Is there any single point which is new? I wish to throw a challenge. Is there no sanctity for Parliament? I know the Constitution has undergone amendments three or four times. But what are the new circumstances that have arisen which justify reconsideration of the matter? Well, Sir, I am asking, what has really happened to justify interference at this stage? I am sure that the answer is 'nothing'. Nothing has happened. Even so, is the agitational approach the correct method in which they should get their grievances redressed?

'No tax campaign' in India after the attainment of independence, do you think, is expedient for anybody to resort to? Are we fighting a foreign Government? What is this "no-tax campaign"? People beyond the several oceans will think very poorly if in a State like the Mysore State people should launch a no-tax campaign. Objection was taken to the inclusion of the word 'outsiders'. We mean those who do not legitimately belong to Mysore. Nobody can call them as people from outside India because all of us are citizens of India and we expect that they would assume a more friendly attitude towards us. Sir, for Satyagraha from Members of Parliament who do not belong to Mysore, where was the necessity, I cannot understand. Then terrorism, false and malicious propaganda in outside papers—Sir, many of my friends have read to me most scandalous allegations being made in outside papers in Maharashtra and papers which do not legitimately belong to Mysore. Is it fair for any class of people to carry on malicious propaganda against the head of the State, the Chief Minister of the State and officers of the Government? I am very sorry. If anybody thinks that their point will be gained by carrying on such malicious propaganda against the officers of the Government, I am afraid, they are going in a wrong way and they are making matters worse for themselves. Well, Sir, this outside interference is a matter which none of us in Mysore can countenance. Let Sri Sunthakar fight me and let me fight him in return and finally we will compose our differences and shake hands. But if a single outsider fights us, no Kannadiga in Mysore will ever tolerate him. We have kept quiet for valid reasons. Sir, defiance of authority and trying to create an atmosphere of insecurity and uncertainty by shooting at officers who are there charged with the responsibility of maintaining law and order—is such a thing done in any organised Government or organised society? Well, my friends who are talking so much on the floor of the House take not the least responsibility for that state of affairs. They may say

“We have nothing to do with it”. You create a certain situation and when that situation goes out of control, you say ‘We unhesitatingly condemn it’. What is the use of that? Why do you allow the situation to go out of control and then say that you do not take the responsibility for it? If not the Samithi, who else will take responsibility for it? I do have some experience of dealing with law and order. No organised Government can sit with folded arms when things are going on like this. They must safeguard the life and property of the individual. They must see that law and order is maintained at all costs. It may be that here and there excesses are committed by the Police. But they will be dealt with in a proper manner. But what is of paramount importance is that law and order should be maintained. If today law and order situation has been brought under control, the credit should go to the Government Officers on the spot, viz., the Deputy Commissioner Mr. Seshadri and the D.S.P. Mr. Lewis. I have not met Mr. Lewis. Sri Seshadri has got very sweet powers of persuasion and he never exceeds his limits. He is a man brought up in that tradition and for anybody to go and try to shoot him and to take his life is a thing which has got to be condemned and somebody in the Samithi or the whole lot of people behind the agitation should take the responsibility for that.

Sir, now, I am coming to the question of minor boundary adjustment. I am afraid, I have tried to get a definition of that expression throughout this Act and it is nowhere mentioned. There is no difference between major and minor adjustments. I am against minor boundary readjustment altogether. When it is not contemplated under the Act, how can you ever put forward that proposal before the Government or anybody? This is due to the fact that when Sri Pant piloted the S.R. Bill on the 15th August 1956, he casually referred that they could consider some minor adjustments. A concrete shape was given to that by making provision in Section 21 of the States Reorganisation Act. That is

with reference to Zonal Council. I want to read the entire Section. Section 21 says:

“(2) In particular, and without prejudice to the generality of the provisions of sub-section (1), a Zonal Council may discuss, and make recommendations with regard to,—

(a) any matter of common interest in the field of economic and social planning;

(b) any matter concerning border disputes, linguistic minorities or inter-State Transport; and

(c) any matter connected with, or arising out of, the reorganisation of the States under this Act”.

What does this section say? It says that this Zonal Council can consider this matter and when both the States agree, the matter may go to the Central Government and they will deal with it. The setting up of the Zonal Council itself is not going to give a guarantee that a minor dispute is going to be considered. I think it is a wrong interpretation of the provision of the Act.

Now, I come to the question of memorandum which the Hon'ble the Chief Minister referred to on the floor of the Bombay Legislature.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—Are you opposed to the resolution because of the minor adjustment?

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—I am saying that we agree to minor adjustment if there is an amicable settlement after agreement between the parties; but when there is total absence of agreement between the parties, where does the question of major or minor adjustment come? Major adjustment is completely ruled out of consideration. Minor adjustment can be done if both the States agree. With regard to the Memorandum, I may state that the atmosphere in which it was submitted to the Government of India is not very happy. I do not wish to say anything about the Hon'ble Chief Minister. He must have his reasons; particularly after the proposed reorganisation of

(SRI J. B. MALLARADHYA)

Maharashtra State, I think Mr. Chavan has taken this attitude towards this problem. Sir, was it necessary on the floor of the House to say that he cannot go to the Chief Minister of Mysore with a begging bowl, "biksha patra"? I am feeling sorry for it. He says that we have got 10 per cent more than what we should have got. Shall I say that he is asking for 100 per cent more than he legitimately deserves? It is not very difficult to give answers like that. To ask for 814 villages and 8 lakhs of people, is it a minor adjustment? It is not a case of "Bhoori dakshina" of the old days. I do not know if King Ashoka could ever afford to give such a "Bhoori dakshina". And that should be incorporated in a memorandum to be submitted to the Government of India! Is it in this atmosphere that you want a peaceful and amicable settlement of the border issue? My friend Sri Narasimhan asks Sri Kothavale 'What about Kasargod'? Our friend's suggestion is that as they have asked for 814 villages, we must revive our claim for Rayadurga, Adoni, Madakasira, Sholapur, Nilgiri and the whole lot of them. We have not put forward such a fantastic proposal though we are anxious that all Kannada-speaking people should join us.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—The Mover of the Resolution definitely made it clear that those areas belong to us and they should come to us.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—It is not there in the Resolution and so I do not wish to import into the resolution more than what it reads. In trying to ask for 814 villages, they are trying to wake us up and join in the agitation. I am afraid it is a wrong approach to this whole problem. Why do you take advantage of our reticence? The whole question is, are the Maharashtrians fighting for a fair deal or raw deal, as was suggested by my friend Sri Nijalingappa? What has happened to them? None of those who are carrying on agitation complained about maltreatment or want of facilities for education or about their claims for any

lenient treatment. There is no single complaint of any significance at least openly made and unless there is some such complaint, how can they ask for a set of villages being given to them? Sir, political parties outside Mysore are keeping up the agitation. But my friend Sri Sunthankar denies it. I am asking him: Is it not a fact and has not the Government got the whole list of people who are actively trying to keep up the agitation alive? Do they belong to the Mysore State? Do you want a list of persons coming from outside Mysore to be mentioned on the floor of this House? But is he repudiating a legitimate charge made against them?

Sir, my friend Sri Patil said that they fought the election on this issue. We are not aware of this. Is it a point to be mentioned? And what about the other people who stood against them and who were successful? Do they seriously say that this was mentioned in their election manifesto?

Sir, one other point was made by my Hon'ble friend Sri V. S. Patil for whom I have great regard; he said that Belgaum was given as a bribe by Gujerathis to the Kannadigas to retain Bombay with them! Even after Bombay has been given to Maharashtra, does he still continue to have the same view? What an uncharitable statement to make in respect of Mysore, that Mysore is anxious to receive bribes! May I say, Sir, that Mysore does not desire to receive bribes? Mysore will get what it deserves and people of Mysore will always adopt constitutional methods to get what they are, by right, entitled to receive. Why should they receive bribes? This kind of a statement on the floor of this Hon'ble House is certainly not fair.

Well Sir, the Government of Mysore has been congratulated by many Hon'ble Members on the floor of this House for their stand. I would rather give that compliment in a hesitant manner. My friend, the Chief Minister has always been mentioning in his Press conferences and elsewhere that minor adjustments are always possible. I am not one of those who can support that position. We are not for any

compromise on this issue. My esteemed friend Sri Sunthakar has said that this question of boundaries and insistence on retaining Marathi areas in Mysore is due to groupism in the Ruling Party. I am not bothered whether groupism is there or not. My concern is, whatever is given to us under the States Reorganisation Act, an Act of Parliament, as a result of the recommendations of the S.R.C., we are not prepared to yield to any Government. To that extent Sri Jatti has got to try and deserve the confidence of the entire House. He is the leader not merely of the Congress Party, but he represents the entire State. He cannot waver, he cannot be vacillating, he cannot be faltering, he cannot yield to the political pressure of either an individual or an organisation or even of the Central Government. That is the point which I want to make on the floor of this House.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—How is he constitutionally correct, Sir? He has to yield to the pressure of the Central Government.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Sir, it is constitutionally wrong for any Government to bring political pressure in that manner.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Sri Narasimhan is suggesting his own remedies.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—I want to take this opportunity of appealing to my friends coming from the Maharashtra area to try and live with us in an atmosphere of friendliness. Sir, I consider that this States Reorganisation as a regular marriage, as it were, with all due ceremony. ಇದು ಅಗ್ನಿ ಸಾಕ್ಷಿಯಾಗಿ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡ ಮದುವೆ, ಇದೇನೂ ಕೂಡಾ ವೈಯಕ್ತಿಕ ತಾಳ್ಮೆ. What is this? It has got the sanctity of law. No man can cut asunder what God has put together. No man can cut asunder. ಇದನ್ನು ಬಿಟ್ಟುಕೊಳ್ಳಿ, ನಮಗೇ ಕೊಟ್ಟುಬಿಡಿ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರೆ, it is a most fantastic statement.

Sri V. S. PATIL.—Sir, in the old times, Hindu marriages were considered a sacrament. Now these marriages under the States Reorganisation Act have been done under the law and no wonder, there is a provision for divorce!

(Laughter)

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—He can seek a divorce. My point is that even today, the majority of the people consider marriage as a sacrament though there may be scope for divorce under the law. We, the people of Mysore, respect tradition. Why should we have this sort of conflict at all? It is not a case of love-marriage where you meet very casually some person while travelling in a railway train, talk to her, develop friendship today and break off from her, after having had all that you wanted!

(Laughter).

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—Sri Mallaradhyia does not know much of love, Sir.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—There is a growing feeling in the country that the Centre has not given a firm decision about it; and there is a vague feeling that on the other hand, they are encouraging it by casual statements made in the Lok Sabha and when they meet private deputations in regard to such matters. What I want to appeal to the Government of India is that just as in the case of Vidarbha where they have given a definite and categorical denial on the question of the constitution of Vidarbha into a separate State, why did they not remain firm in regard to this matter? I was told that the Hon'ble Minister for Home Affairs at the Centre has written to our Chief Minister to consider this. I do not know what is contained in the official documents. I do not want to delve into secrets. Sir, if all this is true, is it the intention of the Government of India that they should re-write the map of India and the States' boundaries have got to be radically altered in order to please Mr. Chavan? Sir, I have got here some press statements of the Proceedings of the Bombay Legislative Assembly and what Mr. Chavan has said in the course of his speech on the floor of the Legislature of Bombay. He says:

"I wrote to Sri Nijalingappa, the then Chief Minister, in the month of October 1957 on this subject."

(SRI J. B. MALLARADHYA)

He has suggested :

“that the Bombay Government should be allowed to claim Belgaum, Nippani and Karwar and agreed to the transfer of Mysore border villages where 60 per cent of Marathi was spoken.”

It is said here, Sir, that, Sri Nijalingappa promised and even the present Chief Minister Jatti is supposed to have agreed to this. It is mentioned here. I do not know if it is true. I do not want to embarrass the Chief Minister on this. I do not know whether he is agreeable to give Nippani. But these statements are there. But in so far as the Chief Minister of Bombay has made a responsible statement, I will presume that they are not correct.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Because Sri Chavan is not a Member of this House, you can say ‘it is not proper.’

5-30 P.M.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—But what I do wish to state is that this is not the atmosphere which any Chief Minister of any State can create for an amicable settlement. Sri Chavan has referred to the fact that in 1957 he referred the matter to the Zonal Council. What concrete recommendations did the Zonal Council make to the Central Government, I want to ask. Why was it not done? He must have made it clear that there was no agreement between the representatives of the States concerned. Some people even to this day refer to the fact that village should be taken as the unit in reconstituting the boundary. That is on the basis of the Pataskar award and this theory has been long exploded. Where is the dispute at all? It is only one State which is doing all this. It is a one-way traffic. The dispute exists only in the minds of a few gentlemen who come from Bombay. Where is the agreement in regard to the allocation of villages? Sir, I want to state on this occasion that the Pataskar award is totally inapplicable to the circumstances of the case. My friend Mr. Chavan refers that as a *via media* a committee

of four members should be appointed to examine the issue. He refers again to arbitration and says that the Mysore Government did not agree to that. Sir, is there any constitutional provision for this kind of a thing? If such irresponsible statements are made, it is very difficult and it will mislead the people. One thing I wish to state on this occasion is that the people of Mysore and the Government of Mysore are being put in the wrong in all their statements. The whole tenor of this memorandum, the whole tenor of the speech made on the floor of the Legislative Assembly appears to have one motive, namely, to keep us in the dock as the accused. Sir, both the Chief Minister and the people of Mysore have made a very correct and a rational approach to this problem. I do not wish to make any more comment on the memorandum submitted by the Government of Bombay. In a very sinister manner my friend the Chief Minister of Bombay, as I already told you, has stated that we have got ten per cent more than what we deserve. I have already said that he is asking for one hundred per cent more than what he deserves. Many Kannada-speaking areas have not come to us. Actually I would say that we have got fifty per cent less than what is due to us. These statistical estimates are not correct unless they are based on facts. The Chief Minister of Bombay referred to an interview he had with the Chief Minister of Mysore which ended in five minutes. The Bombay Chief Minister forgets that our Chief Minister is very businesslike and he won't do anything in five minutes if he can do the same in two or three minutes. Is this a matter which should be made public in a public speech? If our Maharashtrian friends all along want us to be coerced, I am afraid, Sir, they are totally mistaken about us. We, the Kannadigas, are docile up to a stage. If it is a challenge, I humbly submit that we are prepared to take it up unmindful of the consequences. That is not the approach which I want the Hon'ble Members to make. Let us work together. As I said, my friends made use of tall words, and talked of national

MYSORE BORDER ADJUSTMENTS

solidarity and all that. If we have kept quiet without agitation with respect to our territory, it is because of national interests that are involved. People with fissiparous tendencies should be ostracised at all levels. National discipline has got to be maintained, particularly at a time of danger to our northern parts. When we are to fight our external enemy, shall we have to fight internal enemies of separatism, linguism, and casteism, whether of religion or of political ideology? Please do not precipitate matters. Before closing, I must pay my tribute of admiration to those people who identify themselves in the disturbed areas as Mysoreans. I am told on very reliable authority by the officers and others who have gone round Bombay-Mysore border that the local people as such are not interested in this agitation. It is only sponsored and egged on and actually provoked by a few unofficial outsiders, who often go and disturb the tranquillity of those parts. I am once again paying a tribute to those who are anxious to live with us. This "no-tax campaign" has been a flop, if I may use that expression. As Sri Kothavale said, there are many people who are coming in a procession to pay the taxes, because they are afraid of some people. My friend disputed it. If you take even the figures of actual collection, it will go to show that this "no-tax campaign" has been unsuccessful. But they are not taking facts into consideration. One thing, I must appeal to the Government of India. They should not agree to any kind of redistribution of the State boundaries on the representation of the Maharashtrians. That will raise a hornet's nest. I am saying this with a sense of responsibility. Let the Government not yield to political pressure. Heavens will not come down if the demand of a few Maharashtrians is not met. On the other hand, if they concede it, they will get into a mess without knowing how to get out. Sir, I give the fullest support to the motion so ably moved by my friend Sri Veeranna Gowdh.

†Sri MAHMOOD SHARIFF (Broadway).—Mr. Speaker, Sir, the question

about the settlement of the borders issue has remained a vital issue since 1955 and has been causing a great concern not only to the States of Mysore and Bombay, but also to the people living across the border. It is essential therefore that in order to bring about a settlement, to give a go-by to the political uncertainty, it is necessary for us to come to a settlement, possibly to the best satisfaction of both the States and see that a quietus is given to this unfortunate tangle. But in a settlement of this issue consideration of sentiment should not weigh, but higher consideration, in the larger interests of the country; for example, the territorial contiguity and all such questions must be the deciding factors. In this respect you will have to observe no show of force, no fiery speeches, no emotional debates, no coercion, and no undue influence should weigh so as to give this problem rest. I had a very innocuous idea about it. But after a few days, we see that things have deteriorated and measures which may be characterised as reprehensible methods have been employed and we have come to a stage when the case loses its strength on the merit basis and it is substituted by anger and non-violent methods. I am sorry to state this, because I am concerned with the situation as it is developing day-to-day. I feel that it must be decided purely on a democratic basis. It seems to me that so far as the Bombay Government is concerned, it is losing its balance. I may be pardoned if I say that its attitude has become hysterical. I am not saying this in order to malign the Bombay Government. That at any rate seems to be the impression created in my mind.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I would request the Hon'ble Member not to use very strong words. They are not going to improve the situation but on the contrary that may create some sort of bitterness. The Hon'ble Member may say that the attitude is not fair.

Sri MAHMOOD SHARIFF.—I thank you very much having drawn my attention to that aspect of the matter.

(SRI MAHMOOD SHARIFF)

What I wanted to say was that the people of Mysore would not very much relish the attitude of the Bombay Government. Just because it was not possible to come to some settlement on certain matters affecting the two States, the representatives of the Bombay Government have sought the help of the Central Government to see that a satisfactory solution of this tangle is arrived at. So far as the representatives of the Central Government are concerned, I know fully well that they are gentlemen possessed of legal acumen and wisdom and that they are persons who have got political sagacity and therefore I am sure that they are not going to take any partisan attitude about it and they will decide the matter purely on the basis of democratic principles, geographical and territorial integrity, past history of the case, the population aspect of it and the linguistic aspect of it. Without, therefore, taking a retaliatory attitude let us decide the matter purely in a calm and collected atmosphere. Let us not give vent to our emotions as some people across the border are doing. Let us take into consideration all the aspects of the question in a calm and collected atmosphere and come to brass tacks in a purely unemotional mood.

As has been pointed out by several members here, this matter has a conclusive aspect about it. You may remember that in 1955 the States' Reorganisation Commission deliberated upon this subject and took all aspects of the question into consideration. The Commission consisted of people who knew their job and knew exactly how to tackle this difficult task and on the basis of their recommendations an Act was enacted. When it has become an Act, do you think it necessary after five years to disturb the *status quo* and try to change it? What is the necessity and where is the urgency for it? In 1947 I was one of the members of the Constituent Assembly and there in Delhi we sat, deliberated and thought over all the aspects of the question and many of the thinkers then said that the proposal to alter the map of India on

the linguistic basis was going to be pregnant with dangerous possibilities. A majority of the people said that since we had committed ourselves to linguistic States before we attained independence we should have realignment of the States on that basis but some of the political thinkers said that it would give rise to very troublous times. What was apprehended by some political thinkers have come true and we have witnessed tragic happenings in Kerala and Bombay. It seems to me that when we are passing through critical times, all our efforts must be directed to see that no trouble arises and that the re-construction work goes on throughout the country with the full and willing co-operation of the people without giving quarter to fissiparous tendencies. Is there any necessity to dissect the States still further and should there be any sectional move? It seems to me that it is un wisdom on the part of any people to display disruptionist tendency and it should not be given any encouragement at all.

I have to observe that no part of the country is inhabited by only one language group. The whole of India consists of heterogeneous population—people speaking Urdu, Hindi, Kannada and various other languages. Such being the case, there cannot be any scientific carving of any territory because in every State people belonging to the minorities are bound to be there in spite of the adoption of any scientific method of division. Why should the question which has been given the quietus and settled once and for all be disturbed now? India has become one whole and there is no apprehension of any person being meted out injustice. When the Central Government is there to supervise our activities, where is the necessity for the people of a particular community to say that all the people speaking the same language must be brought in one State and that their case must be decided on another basis? The division of India on the linguistic basis has had its bad effect. Why should our Maharashtrian brethren not remain with us and contribute to the Kannada culture? After all, culture is

MYSORE BORDER ADJUSTMENTS

all-embracing and it absorbs all the different linguistic propensities. India's is a synthetic civilization. Various people have come into our country and waves of invasion by foreigners have left their impression on our culture. Such being the case, what is the meaning of our Maharashtrian brethren in saying that they must be made a part of Bombay. My Maharashtrian friends will excuse me if I say that their attitude is unreasonable so far as this matter is concerned. The other day I happened to go to Nippani in connection with collection of information regarding the problem of Beedi workers. Then I had also an occasion to go to Karwar and other places. I had a talk with the leading persons and they all expressed the view that the new move to see that Belgaum and other places should be handed over to the Bombay Government was not correct and they did not relish it. Therefore, it appears to me that we should not disturb the *status quo*. At a time when India is sought to be reconstructed, when there are so many other problems to be solved and when the country is passing through a critical stage, is this the time to agitate for these things? I am very sorry that the agitation is going on. The Chief Minister has observed that so far as the Mysore Government is concerned, we are not going to give back these cities not because we have a love for those cities but because they really belong to us. As a matter of fact we have to get so many other places. We have not yet claimed them. There are so many minorities in the State and can we send them away? From all aspects of the case I would beg of my friends to see that in the larger interests of the country, it is not wise to agitate. I appeal to them not to press these issues.

I congratulate my friend Sri H. K. Veeranna Gowdh and Sri S. Nijalingappa on introducing this resolution. It seems to me that there is no single person who does not agree with the appropriateness of the resolution. Thank you.

†Dr. R. NAGAN GOWDA (Hospet).—I take this opportunity of making a few observations on this question. I

will not go into the details regarding various areas. In my district I might mention that we have areas like D. Hirehalu, Kowthala and other places not to mention places like Madakasira which have to come into Mysore. During the struggle for independence we had adopted certain methods to get our objectives achieved. We had Satyagraha, no-tax campaign and other methods but after we attained independence, having our own Government, is it necessary for us to adopt those methods? When we have our own Government, Parliament and legislatures, is this the method that we should adopt? This is the time when we should meet in Assemblies like this in various States and discuss the matters and settle things. At such a time if our friends from Maharashtra adopt the methods that they have done, to say the least, is not wise. These things can be achieved by reasonable methods.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—What about Kerala?

Mr. SPEAKER.—You can leave it to Sri M. C. Narasimhan's monopoly.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—Sir, I definitely take objection to that statement. Let me make my position clear. It is not the privilege of only the Communist party to raise such questions. Why do you shut out other members from raising such questions? Why do you suggest that it is only my monopoly?

Mr. SPEAKER.—You must understand the spirit in which I have said it. You must enjoy the fun of it.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—Then it is all right.

Dr. R. NAGAN GOWDA.—The Communist parties all over the world have different methods. It is known to everybody. They have got a history and the methods they have adopted all over the world are known. But in a democratic system of Government, those methods are not necessary.

There is one more point which I wish to make clear. We live in a country of which we are all citizens first and then we are inhabitants of various States. We should not forget

(DR. R. NAGAN GOWDA)

the lessons of the history of this country. The troubles that we had amongst ourselves before the British came in, the fights that we used to have between different areas, led to the coming in of the outsiders.

6 P.M.

The feelings that are being created between two groups of people, between communities and communities in these areas, if carried further, will lead to disagreement and disaffection. All this is not conducive to creating a united homogeneous nation. I therefore suggest that it is better that our friends stop this kind of agitation. When we have parliamentary system of Government, there is no room for this kind of agitation. I would be glad if our Government could tell them that so long as this kind of agitation which has been described by my friends Sri Mallaradhya and Sri Nijalingappa already just now, continue in the streets of Belgaum, they will not take up this question of settlement either minor or major. This is a stand which is necessary for our Government to take. We should live in peace and adopt peaceful methods. Thank you.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN (Kolar Gold Fields).—Sir, I shall not take much time of the House because it is already late. I would like to place a few observations about the resolution. Sir, the resolution as worded presents a certain difficulty though the substantial aspects of the resolution I am in agreement with.

Sir, there are two aspects of the resolution which cannot be comprehended and about which I was trying to find out if there could be an answer from several speeches in support of the resolution as well as in opposition to the resolution. Sir, the first aspect of it is that the resolution not merely speaks about the border disputes which the State of Mysore has got with the neighbouring States, but it also seeks to advise the other States which have similar disputes. I do not know if it is correct for us. It should be left to the respective Assemblies is my humble

suggestion. For example, there is the question of Bihar and Bengal or there is the question of Madras and Kerala. These are all controversial questions which are there on the border. Now, we are trying to say here that these border issues should not be opened unless agreed to by the States.

Sri H. K. VEERANNA GOWDH.—If the Hon'ble Member yields, I would like to make the point clear. From the speeches made by certain members, I see that they very often refer to the question of other Kannada speaking areas. By over-sight my resolution in the first paragraph does not contain the words 'between Bombay and Mysore'. That perhaps might have given room for many members to think that we are completely neglecting other Kannada areas about which we have got a claim. This resolution is particularly with regard to border dispute between Bombay and Mysore. Therefore, I can assure the Hon'ble Members who are very doubtful or suspicious about other areas that it is altogether a different question. So, we need not now take up that question and mix it up with this. My resolution refers definitely to Mysore-Bombay borders because of recent ugly and violent incidents which have given room for unlawful activities and which have prevented a peaceful atmosphere to prevail in that area. It is only with that object I have moved this resolution and I have made my position clear in my speech that this resolution refers only to the Bombay and Mysore dispute.

†Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—Sir, I thank the mover of the Resolution for the clarification. All along the speeches that are delivered and the resolution as it stood only referred to a general thing. That is why the doubt arose.

Sri H. K. VEERANNA GOWDH.—The second paragraph definitely contains details about it.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—That is why I said, there is need for amendment. In my amendment I have specifically made it clear that what we are concerned with or we should be concerned with is boundaries of the Mysore State and not of other areas. Even then,

there is one difficulty which has not been answered and that is this. Sir, if we are saying in respect of Mysore-Bombay border that because there is violent agitation and what is known as unlawful activities we are trying to discuss the quest on in a proper manner or we are not prepared to allow any amendment to S. R. Act, then there is one other difficulty which will have to be met by the Movers of the Resolution and it is this. In respect of other areas, Sir, simply because there is no agitation on the borders by Kannada speaking people, for example, Madakasira or Kasargod or other area, it should not mean that we are not alive to their demand or that we are not prepared to take up the question to the extent it is possible or to the extent it is permissible. We should not try to give an impression that we are not prepared to take active steps in that direction. That is my fear and that is why I move that amendment. Now, secondly, if it is argued that because there is unlawful agitation we should not raise this issue, then I do not appreciate we should concede the question of even minor adjustments. Sir, whether it is a minor adjustment or any type of adjustment whatever, it should arise only either in respect of an agitation through democratic means or on the merits of the case. Here, unfortunately, if we take the position that because of agitation, we are not prepared to concede any justness of the claim, then we should be opposed to minor adjustment also. Taking all these facts into account, what I felt was that the sponsors of the resolution could concede that there was some difficulty about the border whether it was a minor thing or a major thing. One does not know what is minor or what is major in that context. Whatever it be, there must be some machinery with regard to this. I will explain my position further. Here, we see there is an admission by the sponsors of the resolution that there is a minor dispute or that there is possibility of a minor dispute. Now that that position is conceded, if we say that it is to be resolved only by agreement between two States. But we have seen that it is not possible of

quick solution. If an agreement is possible, then there is no necessity for a resolution of this type. that are not able to solve it on the basis of agreement in the Zonal Council or on the basis of discussion makes it clear that the possibility of an agreement at least up to now is ruled out. One does not know about the future. It may be possible. We may hope that it is possible to achieve it by agreement. But unfortunately, as things stand today, it looks as though the chances of agreement are also receding. Sir, I have got this in mind when I say this. Sir, have we seen in the history of any of the States; whether it is United States which has a federal constitution or Australia, which has a similar constitution where the respective State Legislatures and the respective States which form the constituent units of federal constitution fighting as it were? That is what is exactly happening today. Today, we are passing this resolution and likewise the Bombay State Legislature is also passing a resolution. Here a very strange situation has arisen. Two States are quarrelling; it is not a question of two parties quarrelling; it is not a question of two groups quarrelling; unfortunately, a situation has arisen wherein two States are ranged against each other.

Sir, unfortunately our constitution is silent on the manner in which such conflicts should be resolved. My feeling is that our Constitution assumes that such major conflicts and conflicts on subjects which do strictly come within the purview of the State List, could be solved and resolved except with reference to the Parliament. Sir, I honestly feel, I sincerely feel that this question, instead of being thrown to respective legislatures, ought to have been solved unofficially. My own feeling is that the respective parties, for example, there is the Congress interested, there is the P.S.P. and other parties in the State Legislatures—the leaders of parties should have met and should have tried to bring about some sort of an amicable understanding—at least a workable arrangement in respect of the disputed areas and it should have

(SRI M. C. NARASIMHAN)

been possible for them to arrive at some sort of agreement. If that was not possible, as an alternative, at least they should have seen that the agitation would not assume its present form. If there was agreement between the parties, the parties being the political parties, of the Government of India, the political parties in Maharashtra or Mysore and the political parties in the Bombay State and those who were really responsible for the agitation on the other side, they could have sat together. Some arrangement must have been made instead of this matter being left to be fought over. It is unfortunate even that much of leadership appears to be totally lacking. Sir, the question of border adjustment was always there before the Parliament. When the States' Reorganisation Act was mooted or when the debates took place in the respective Assemblies and in Parliament on the S.R. Commission Report, this question was already there. It was not as if there was anything new about it. It was already there even then. This situation should have been envisaged and could have been easily envisaged. As my Hon'ble friend Mr. Mahmood Shariff pointed out, even those people who did not want linguistic states, said that it was not a laudable idea. Parliament neither accepted the linguistic principle nor rejected it. By and large, it accepted the linguistic principle, after Kerala, Madras and Andhra came into being mostly on the basis of language. Let us forget for a moment minor areas, but by and large, it did accept that principle; and having accepted it, it must have categorically stated that if such conflicts arose, those conflicts should be resolved. Unfortunately, the S.R. Act did not lay down the principles or the basis on which these conflicts which might arise, or which it was known, would arise, might be solved. Now we are in a very difficult position.

The resolution says that there should be agreement between the two States and I, for one would certainly welcome agreement if it is possible. But supposing as in the case of Bombay,

no agreement is possible, can we in respect of Kasargod, Madakasira or in respect of the Kannada areas in other States, come to similar agreements? I was watching Sri Sunthakar saying that if we agreed to the Marathi areas going to Bombay, then only the question of our claiming Kannada areas from Bombay State would arise. Naturally, anybody would say like that. Because, if it is agreement it would not be an agreement in the sense in which the sponsors of the resolution want it. I am sure that the subject will become the question of bargaining and trial of mutual strength of parties and all that. That is why I say, Sir, though it is a very good idea that there should be agreement, very often this agreement cannot be obtained by negotiation. But it is our duty to explore all possibilities for an agreement. I am of course in agreement with the principle of an agreement. But unfortunately, as a practical measure, is it possible to get agreement? Today, we find that it is no longer possible. I am also surprised at the way in which a responsible person like the Chief Minister of Bombay makes statements. I do not accuse anybody. When a responsible member of another State Legislature, when a responsible officer of another State says, when he makes certain statements in such extremely controversial matters, it is rather difficult for us. We do not know what is happening in Bombay. We do not know the rival claims. Statistics are disputed. Sri Mallaradhya gives one set of figures, Sri Kothavale gives another set of figures, Sri Sunthakar gives a different set of figures, and Bombay Government gives another set of figures. In this confusing situation, how are we to resolve this issue? While dealing with the Governor's Address, Sir, I made a statement that the Chief Minister had agreed to give away Nippani. It was not controverted at that time. Only the Minister for Public Works said that it would be an act of bravado if anybody agreed like that.

Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—It is not open to the Hon'ble Members in this House or anybody in the country

to draw inferences. It must be based on facts. I drew your attention to the fact that the Hon'ble Chief Minister had made it very clear and stated it over and over again that the question was closed. And the only question that remains is the border problem and for that the representatives in the four man committee should agree. In spite of that statement, if you go on assuming that you had some fears and some doubts, who can prevent you from having doubts?

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—Sir, the point was clear. I made that observation on the basis of my own information. I do not wish to play on it. Unfortunately for me, even the Chief Minister of Bombay State was making a very responsible statement on the floor of the Bombay Legislature; he virtually said as quoted by Sri Mallaradhya that Sri Nijalingappa was prepared to concede on principle and that principle being that if any area contained more than 60 per cent of people speaking Marathi, that area might be given to Bombay. I do not want to make any accusation against anybody. Unfortunately, he has made a statement like that. It is for this Government to contradict it and I am sure the Chief Minister will contradict it. Likewise, he said—I refer to the report contained in the *Times of India* .. One might say that it is pro-Marathi or pro-Bombay State. Any way, it is a responsible newspaper which gives the statement that the Hon'ble Chief Minister of Bombay has made that Nippani may be conceded to Bombay State.

Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—As against the statement made by the Chief Minister, you are simply referring to some newspaper report and you prefer to believe newspapers against the statement of the Chief Minister.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—I am not saying that I want to believe the report of the *Times of India*. I would be very glad if I am told that what the *Times of India* says is a lie. He is also a responsible officer of the Bombay State and he cannot give way to his thought so easily. So, in this context, when there is such a controversy,

without going into the various aspects of this matter, what I would suggest in this regard is the proper method whereby these conflicts are resolved.

Sir, I would also in this connection submit that I am in agreement with the spirit of this Resolution to this extent and that is this: I do not wish that the question only of Mysore-Bombay border is settled and not other areas. Sir, if the question of border disputes is to be settled in respect of Mysore, I would like that all border disputes which the Mysore State has got with other States should be simultaneously resolved. Therefore, it is no use our trying to look at it only as though there is a dispute between Mysore and Bombay. There is no dispute that has arisen. Sir, in that sense, we have our dispute in respect of Kasargod, we have our dispute in respect of Madakasira, with the Andhra and Kerala Governments.

When that is the position there, why should we try to think that only the Mysore-Bombay border issue exists and no other? At the same time we cannot forget for the moment that whatever stand we take in respect of the Mysore-Bombay border will necessarily affect the other areas also. Therefore we will have to pursue in respect of other areas also. Supposing we agree in pursuance of resolution passed in the Bombay Legislature or in pursuance of the persuasion of my friend Mr. Sunthakar, even then we are faced with the question of other borders. As sponsors of the resolution and as the statement made by Mr. Veeranna Gowdh, it is certainly clear that even the sponsors of the resolution want the other areas, Kannada speaking areas generally to Mysore. When we are prepared to put claims in respect of Kasargod and other areas in Madras State, there is nothing wrong for us to agree to settle this dispute. Hereafter we will have to ask for the Kannada speaking areas of Kasargod, Alur, Adoni, etc. So we will not be resolving this conflict at all, but we have to solve it if we have to live in peace. I do not want whatever stand we take in respect of Mysore-Bombay border to

(SRI M. C. NARASIMHAN)

be used by some other Governments as an obstacle to our claims in respect of other areas.

So, Sir, I feel that it is necessary to pass a resolution whereby we say that in respect of other disputes, the Government of India should appoint a boundary commission to slightly redraw the boundaries of the State. I agree with the idea in this resolution. That it should not be a total revision. After all the S.R.C. and the Parliament more or less accepted the linguistic principle. I do not want to redraw the map giving up that. Sri Muckannappa might argue that we want the old Mysore area alone. Boundaries are fixed by the S.R. Act by and large and they should not be altered. There should be only certain adjustments. That should be decided by a Boundary Commission. It is better to leave it to an impartial authority which will decide on the basis of Union principles. I feel that my resolution cuts across all these controversies. It will not offend friends on this side nor will it go against the spirit of the resolution moved by Sri Nijalingappa and Sri Veeranna Gowdh.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Do you mean to say that your amendment is wise, because it satisfies both the parties?

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—I am not saying that it satisfies both. I am certain that it does not satisfy my friend Mr. Sunthakar, because they want the land to go to Bombay. The movers of the resolution will oppose them and show the Kasargod area. Still another merit of my resolution is that it does not confine itself to the Bombay-Mysore border area. If the sponsors of the resolution seem to think and want to end with this issue alone, it would not be correct. Immediately in respect of other border areas, problems will be created. Unfortunately in the long run, it may not be correct to confine it to the present issue of Bombay-Mysore border only. So, Sir, in view of this, I earnestly and sincerely feel that the conflict of the border

issue should be settled whole hog and not piece-meal and give room for further agitation. Supposing we settle only this one issue and effect a solution for the Mysore-Bombay border areas, then agitation will start in the other Kannada areas, such as Kasargod, etc. After all, I know for certain that the linguistic agitation first started in Mysore and in Andhra. Maharashtra was not the first place where the agitation started. I remember having participated in the Karnataka Ekikarana conference. People from Gujarath and Maharashtra said that Kannadigas were leading the agitation. So, it may not be that it will stop at this. Perhaps if I may state when Bombay is conceded as a bi-lingual State and is divided, then border issues will again be there.

Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—May I request the Hon'ble Member to give this information to the House? At any time, when the Communist party was ruling in Kerala, did you make any suggestion to the Communist party to hand over Kasargod to Mysore?

Mr. SPEAKER.—I think such matters are outside the scope of the debate.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—Now that the matter has been raised, I will make only one submission. I have made it clear even in this House also that we stand for linguistic provinces. There is no doubt about that. So far as our party is concerned, it has also stood for linguistic provinces. A reference was made the other day by our Chief Minister to the statement alleged to have been made by Sri Namboodripad in respect of Kasargod. I tried to verify that matter. I have looked into it. The information that I am able to place before this House is this. In Mangalore, when he was there, he had a press conference where he said with regard to Kasargod going to Karnataka, he as a member of the Communist party had no objection. But it could not be solved with his consent only. He said he would be convening a meeting of all the political parties in Kerala and try to make an issue only if all the parties were united. He did convene an

unofficial meeting. He made it clear that the Communist party stood for linguistic provinces. So far as Kasargod was concerned, he said he had no difficulty that it should go to Mysore. He had it clear that it was not a question of Communist party agreeing to this policy, but all other parties also should agree. The same is being done in Bombay and also in Mysore.

I would once again emphasise that this question should be solved peacefully. But any stand we are likely to take should not compromise our position, our claims in respect of other areas. This approach would be better. It is rather unfortunate that the two State Legislatures of Bombay and Mysore are being led to the position of conflict. With these words, I close.

6-30 P.M.

† Sri BALWANT RAO (Bhalki).—Mr. Speaker, Sir, I rise to oppose the resolution and support the amendment moved by my Hon'ble friends Sri V. S. Patil and Sri Sunthakar. I oppose the resolution because it strikes at the very root of the rights of Maharashtrians in the border area. It strikes at the root of the rights of not only Maharashtrians but also at the root of the rights of Kannadigas who are now in other States. One thing is that our Government read the news in the paper that the Bombay Assembly was going to pass a resolution in respect of the border issue and on reading that our Government thought of passing a counter-resolution as a counterblast to the resolution of the Bombay Assembly. Therefore, in a hurry they brought a resolution in this House which is before us. One of the members of the ruling party has brought this resolution because the Government has adopted a very wrong policy in deciding this border issue and it is certain that they will fail in solving this problem because of their wrong policy and wrong path. Therefore, Government want to shift the responsibility for their failure to this House and they want the zeal of this House on their wrong policy. Therefore, we should not support this

resolution. This resolution by itself will not help us to solve this border problem; on the contrary, it will create complications. Not only that but it will also deprive the Mysore State of other Kannada areas which are now in other States. Therefore, I appeal to all members to oppose this resolution and support the amendments moved by my Hon'ble friends. I heard some speeches from some responsible members which teach us lessons about unity and integrity. I want to know whether they were preaching these lessons before the formation of the Mysore State. Before the formation of the Mysore State they were of the opinion that unless and until all the people speaking the same language were brought in one State, their progress and development would be impossible. Now, after achieving their goal of Mysore State, all of a sudden they have changed their mind and they are saying now that if we go on like this it will be harmful to the integrity and unity of India. If these Hon'ble members believed that such linguistic quarrels would create disunity in the country, why were they advocating the cause of linguistic States at all? Now that they have achieved their goal, if this question is re-opened, they are afraid that it will go against the Mysore State. Therefore, they are preaching just the opposite of what they were preaching before the formation of the Mysore State. Some references are being made to the opinions of individual literary figures and to historical events and on the basis of that they want to say that Belgaum and Karwar areas belong to the Mysore State. I want to say that in those days only one man was saying like that but now hundreds of Maharashtrian giants are saying that Belgaum, Karwar and Bidar must go to Maharashtra. Then, why these supporters of the resolution do not agree with the opinion expressed by hundreds of Maharashtrian giants? Now, we are living in democracy and we are being governed by democratic principles. If you want to decide this problem in a democratic way we should not rely only upon some historic

(SRI BALWANT RAO)

events or the opinions of individuals. They will not lead us anywhere. For example, if we rely upon historical facts, then all the Hyderabad Karnatak must go to the Nizam because he was ruling there for a long time. Similarly, the Mysore State must go to Maharashtra because long ago they were ruling here. Therefore, this reliance upon some historical facts will not lead us to any solution and we have to decide this problem on democratic and linguistic basis.

Regarding Bidar District, even the eminent Judges of the Hyderabad High Court have expressed the opinion that Bidar District belongs to Maharashtra and relying upon their opinion, that Government have applied Maharashtra customs and laws to the people of that area. If we rely only upon some individual opinions, then the whole of the Bidar District must go to Maharashtra but I say that that is not the correct method of solving this problem in these democratic days.

Now, I come to Bidar border dispute. Some of my friends have said that the present arrangement there was made on the basis of an agreement. I most humbly submit that that is incorrect. The S.R. Commission had recommended the formation of the Telengana State and had suggested the inclusion of Bidar in that State and not in Karnataka. But because the Telengana State did not come into existence, it was decided that the Bidar District must be trifurcated on the basis of language. The Maharashtra representatives of that area demanded that a village or at least a revenue circle must be taken as the unit to bifurcate it, but unfortunately there was no agreement between the M.L.As. of Maharashtra and the M.L.As. of Karnataka. Therefore, the Hyderabad Government recommended that only taluk must be taken as the unit. Accordingly, three taluks went to Maharashtra, two taluks to Andhra and four taluks to the Mysore State. On the contrary, where there was an agreement, even a revenue circle was taken as the unit. For example, take the

Nirna and Nayakal circles. The Nirna circle has gone to Andhra State and the Nayakal circle has come to the Mysore State. Had there been any such agreement between the representatives of Maharashtra and Karnataka, these bilingual taluks would have been bifurcated and two or three revenue circles of Bhalki and two revenue circles of Aurad would have gone to Maharashtra. Therefore I deny that there was any agreement regarding the present arrangement of Bidar District.

Some people say as to what harm is there if Maharashtra live in Mysore State. I would like to say that if we live for a few years like this, we would cease to live as Maharashtra. I can give any number of instances to show how we are treated here. Let us first talk about the language. It is stated that every facility would be given to protect the rights of Maharashtra. But, if you go to Bidar District you will see that the Marathi language which was spoken and used as an official language prior to reorganisation, is being replaced by Kannada and the Marathi schools are being closed. In the high school of Aurad taluk of Bidar District Marathi classes upto 10th standard were being run but now they are closed and only Kannada classes are run. In the same way in the Girls' school only two Marathi teachers are there and the remaining teachers are all Kannadigas. These Kannada teachers are asked to teach Marathi girls. These teachers take tuition the previous day and come to the classes next day to teach the students. If a person does not know Kannada, he is not recruited to services. I had tabled a question but unfortunately the Chief Minister denied it. We had some material proof but we could not prove as we were not given any opportunity. It is needless for me to say that through language our culture and arts grow. Therefore we give so much importance to our problem. Like Kannada people who want to survive, we also want to survive. We will lose our language and everything if we continue to remain here. It is a legitimate

demand and therefore the Marathi speaking areas must be permitted to go to Maharashtra. Otherwise there will be no solution or protection for these Maharashtrians.

I will just tell the difficulties that are created in villages. All the Marathi records have now been converted into Kannada and it is expected that all people should know Kannada. The people there cannot write a single word in Kannada but they are directed to maintain all village records in Kannada. Recently when elections to Gram Panchayats were held, the nomination papers and voters' list were all in Kannada and not even in the national language Hindi. The people of that area did not understand that language and could not file the nomination paper in time. Therefore I most humbly submit that if the Government wants to see that the Maharashtrians should survive, they must be allowed to go to Maharashtra and that is the only solution. I do not know why the Kannadigas are trying to deny us this right. Our right is based on democratic demand but the denial of it is like an imperialistic order. I therefore most humbly beg of this House to support our amendments and help us in solving this problem.

†Sri MAQSOOD ALI KHAN (Bidar).— I rise to support the resolution. I will confine my remarks to Bidar only. Just now something was said by an Hon'ble Member that on account of some disagreement between the M.L.As. and the representatives of those areas at the time of reorganisation of States, certain parts which naturally belonged to Maharashtra went wrongly to Mysore area. I think it is a wrong statement on the very face of it. When the States Reorganisation Commission came to Bidar and held long discussions with the members of the legislature at that time and even met representatives of that State, they came to the conclusion that Bidar should merge with Telengana. But as that State did not come into existence, there was a discussion later on in the Assembly and it was decided that the Bidar district should be divided into three parts. According to that,

three taluks had to go to Bombay, two taluks to Andhra and four taluks to the Mysore State. It was discussed at great length whether there should be any cutting of an area from a taluk unit. There was the question of Nyalkal in Bidar taluk and that taluk was predominantly inhabited by the Telugu speaking people. It was decided that it should go to Andhra Pradesh and it was allowed to go to Andhra. In the case of Rashidabad taluk as most of the people inhabiting the areas were speaking Kannada, it was decided that it should go to Mysore and it was, therefore, merged with the Mysore State. But, now to say that there was no agreement between the representatives or to say that taluk was taken only the basis for integration, is a wrong statement.

It was stated that there was maltreatment of Marathi speaking people. I should submit that it has been the endeavour on the part of the Government and officials to see that the people speaking different languages get their due share and there should not be any grievance on their part against the Government. At present if we see the reports of the Police Patels and criminal reports that are registered in register No. 18, all are in Marathi and there has been no objection to that. Even if the Shanbhogues were to submit their report and mutation records in Marathi no objection is taken to that.

All the pahanis that are maintained in the District are maintained in Marathi. No objection has been taken to that. Something has been said about the Bidar Girls' High School. I should like to say that it is not on account of the fact that the Government is rather averse to the demands of the Marathi speaking people there that some of the teachers are not posted there. I think the school is rather short of staff, and as the case is with Marathi language, it is also the case with Urdu language and even Kannada language. There are not a good number of teachers there. So everybody is feeling that difficulty. The other thing is I have certain doubts as other members also have

(SRI MAQSOOD ALI KHAN)

those doubts in regard to the phrase— it is not a happy one—‘minor adjustments’. If we go on acceding to the demands of other States, a time would come when a minor adjustment would turn into a major adjustment. But if the mover of the resolution was quite clear in his mind and if it was his intention and if I am to express the same, I would be right, if I say, ‘Minor adjustments’ mean such changes which do not involve rather big exchange of population or big exchange of territory. If that is not what is meant by minor adjustment, then a situation might arise where we have unfavourable things done to our State. If it is a question of exchange of small slices of territory or small portion of population, that may be done. But big chunks of territory or large number of population cannot be transferred.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—What is meant by ‘small’?

Sri MAQSOOD ALI KHAN.—Minor adjustment means only exchange of territory which does not involve major portions of territories. It is left to the State or to the authorities concerned to work out these things. There is another danger, Sir, that when the bi-lingual State of Bombay is formed, the Zonal Council would disappear and all the matters would be left to the Central Government. I think there would be a time when the Government would feel unhappy when pressure would be brought to bear upon this Government to yield to certain things. I would like as every one of us would like that our Government should be firm in this respect and they should not yield as has been expressed by all the members and they should not come to any settlement that would be unfavourable to our interests. So saying, I am done.

Sri M. MALLIKARJUNASWAMY (Malavalli).—Mr. Speaker, Sir, while wholeheartedly endorsing the special resolution pertaining to boundary issue of our State sponsored by our veteran Congress leaders of our State

H. K. Veeranna Gowdh and S. Nijalingappaji, and paying my handsome tribute to the Government for taking a bold stand in this regard and thanking the Speaker profusely for giving me the opportunity to speak on this vital issue and requesting the Government of India and the Parliament not to budge even an inch from their firm stand and to be firm in maintaining the decisions taken by the Boundary Commission, I say emphatically that any deviation from the accepted principle will tell upon the national solidarity and integration. I was hearing with rapt attention, the array of arguments and counter-arguments of this side, including the opposition and the members of the M.E.S. on the other, respectively on this issue.

In this context, I say it is not only in the national scale and in the international sphere and on an international scale peace is required to maintain the economic standards of the humanity.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, Sir, our Prime Minister Nehrujee is striving hard in this direction. He has been hailed to the skies as an apostle and a messenger of peace in the western hemisphere. Hence the necessity of peace in the national sphere.

You know very well, Sir, that attempts are being made in this age for the formation of World Government. Sri Nehruji is at it and working in this direction. He may rightly be called an international citizen.

You are aware, Mr. Speaker, Sir, after the two great World Wars leaders of several nations understood the value of peace for the prosperity of Nations and accordingly the League of Nations and U.N.O. respectively came into being as a sequel to attempts at the formation of World Government. Therefore, I say or we may say that the factors that go to form a nationality need not all of them be present like common race, common language, religion, etc. The concept of nationalism is of a very recent origin. The states were organised on the basis of nationality in the recent times.

In our own country, for instance, before independence, though our country had some or almost all the factors that go to make a country a nation there was a lot of controversy in the minds of political thinkers and writers whether India was a nation at all, and this was almost an enigma which ransacked the brains of these political writers. This is all in fact due to diverse castes, creeds, religions and languages. But whatever the diversity might be, they saw that there was unity in diversity, common political aspirations, common economic aspirations but India as a nation was not independent; and it was desirous of becoming independent.

As all of us are very well aware, when the Britishers came to our country under the false pretext of trade they had in their minds the policy of the imperialistic expansion of the British Empire. This was their ulterior motive. In keeping with this motive they established the East India Company and the Governors or Managers of this Company were working under the instructions of their Majesty's Government's directions.

They saw to their own advantage that the ground in India was fertile for their expansionist policy. They saw to their advantage the subsistence and existence of innumerable petty principalities ruled over by many a petty principal and chief. They saw there was keen rivalry among them. They came to know that there was neither unity nor solidarity among them. These petty principalities were of different races. And, the Britishers exploited such a sorry state of affairs and situation to their own advantage.

You know, Mr. speaker Sir, these petty principalities and chiefs and Rajas did not exist and subsist on their own strength but on their loyalties to their white masters. Some of them, why most of them who were highly selfish and who were given to luxury and ease loving, who had hatred, illwill based on difference of races, language, religion among themselves played into the hands of the Governors and Managers of the East India Company. But some of them inspired

by innate love and patriotism stood against them and fought them out and in the end due to the internal machinations, intrigue and conspiracy on the part of these petty chiefs and the 'divide and rule' policy of the whites, the efforts on the part of the patriotic people of some of the principalities to save their motherland from foreign domination and thralldom proved utterly futile.

But in the end, after realisation of the ulterior motive of the Britishers, there sprang up a feeling of oneness. They realised their past folly and they thought of solidarity, unity and integrity of the people and the country. Thus the common political, social and economic aspirations made them get together under a common political institution like the Congress and they fought for freedom and got freedom. Therefore we may say that neither language nor common race, and, neither religion nor territory nor customs, etc., are at all necessary.

Let me tell here, that there are two schools of thought. One school vehemently opposes that nationalism is an ideal in politics, it is a menace to civilisation and further they have said that nationalism has often degenerated into Zingoism. Zingoism means, a "proud and boastful habit of mind about one's own nation accompanied by a supercilious and hostile attitude towards other nations." The other school upholds that nationalism makes for consolidation, integration and prosperity of the nations.

With this introduction, I come to the points referred to in the speech on the boundary issue of our Hon'ble friend, Sri V. S. Patil. He referred to the election results of that area and the votes polled by the candidates of the Maharashtra Ekikarna Samithi and all that and the defeat of Congress candidates at their hands. But here as a student of political history, I say that these election results should not be adduced as the valid reasons for their unwarranted claim of some portions of the newly integrated State of Mysore to form and go to Bombay as part and parcel of that State. It is exactly at this juncture; I say that we will have

(SRI M. MALLIKARJUNASWAMY)

to take into account, the political psychology of the voters, the political and social institutions and the affinity of the voters to these institutions and to the candidates, caste and communal considerations and more than this, the intrinsic worth of the candidates in the estimation of the voters, *i.e.*, the electorate. As an example, the citation of the Kerala Election results may be adduced in this behalf.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Hon'ble Member Sri V. S. Patil further referred to some history and maps written and drawn by a British lieutenant, a Military Officer in the force stationed or attached to the Palace of Chikka Devaraja Vodeyar, Mysore. But here, I cannot but quote the observations made by an authority on the South India History namely Professor Neelakanta Sastri. He has observed that the history written by the British historian or white historians and the maps drawn up by them demarcating the boundaries are for strategic purposes and they are false and misleading as they have been written up in keeping with their policy of imperialistic expansion of the British Empire and their control and having in their minds the main policy of 'Divide and Rule'.

Thirdly, he referred to the taking of plebiscite there. How could this be taken or resorted to here? There is no provision for this either in the Constitution or in any statute of Parliament. The Marathi speaking area is not even geographically contiguous. The Marathi speaking people in this area put together do not form a nation by themselves, thanks to the framers of the Indian Constitution for not making any such provision in the Constitution. Even in the States' Reorganisation Act there is no scope for such a thing. The plebiscite may be a good weapon in determining and resolving an issue of this nature. But the framers of the Constitution know that this weapon, if provided for, would be liable to be misused, in a country like India with diverse castes, creeds and religions. Therefore I say,

it is meaningless to plead for taking plebiscite. Talking of plebiscite means further the conferring on them the right of self-determination which again is meaningless.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, as we know it is for the first time in the history of our country that we are having a strong centralised Government. We want to maintain our hard won independence intact. These plebiscite and right of self-determinations do not help us.

Therefore, the principle of single citizenship unlike America is or has been recognised in our Constitution. I know the Marathas ruled from the River Krishna to the Indus. Their predominance was more in the north than in the south. Into the south also, I say, they had extended their territorial jurisdiction in the three districts of Hyderabad, Bijapur, Kolhapur and I am told some envoys were sent by them to Srirangapatam of the erstwhile Mysore State, when Tippu, the Mysore Tiger, was in power. That is why we see to-day many of the Marathas or Maratha speaking people in those parts of Mysore District. Just because they do not speak Kannada it does not mean that they will be treated as slaves of Kannadigas.

There are provisions in our Constitution for the protection of the minorities. There are several such other safeguards for their protection.

I, therefore, earnestly appeal to the Hon'ble members who are the representatives of that area and I appeal to the people to think in terms of national unity, integration and prosperity of the nation. When there are several other problems like the economic, social and political ones facing the country it is not desirable to have such an attitude of separatist tendency and an attitude of mental vivisection as this will not help us to solve our vital issues touching the interests of the common man at large.

Is is exactly here, I remember, Mr. Speaker Sir, that issues of this sort originate in the minds of thinkers in the first place as wars originate in the minds of men, and take concrete shapes and then put before the public which consists of people who are given to colossal ignorance and stupendous poverty

and who do not know the past history of their country, the political history which is blank and history of internal strife, warfare and disunity and of humiliation, subjugation, slavery and what not. The people follow their leaders because they are their leaders. They are leaders working for them and for the perpetuation of their own interests. When such ideas are put before the people in their concrete form, they follow their leaders, ideas blindly and act upon the same. Individually everybody is good but collectively everybody becomes bad. The mob psychology is always hydraheaded.

I, therefore, appeal to the representatives of Marathi speaking people and the people of that area not to follow their leaders and their ideas which are not conducive to their well-being or to the well-being of the nation at large and become a prey and easily susceptible to the ideological influences of their leaders whose main motive is to exploit mass ignorance for self-aggrandisement, to fulfil their selfish ends and survive as leaders.

It is exactly at this mark or point, I recollect, the essential characteristic feature of the Marathas. And I pay my handsome tribute to Chhatrapathi Shivaji Maharaj for his patriotism and his successors who ruled for years and who stood against the foreign incursions into the country and curbed down the Muslim domination in the country. I say they are of warrior class. They had and have no nose for money or land in turn translated into money.

When the essential characteristic feature of Maratha race is such, I do not see any reason whatsoever in the claim of leaders sprung up from such a historic race demanding here and there some patches of earth, sod of soil to go over to Bombay area.

It is here I say that when a vital issue as between China, our historic old friendly neighbour, and our India, as regards the frontier lines is threatening the country and world at large now and peace has come to trial it is not fair on the part of the representatives of M.E.S. to think in terms of asking for land.

It is at this point, I say, instead of facing the common enemy as Sri Mallaradhy put it we have to face our own enemies within our own camps.

I, therefore, say in the face of such glaring unemployment situation in the country has got to face now, it is not fair on the part of the Marathi speaking people and their leaders to take up such an aggressive attitude such as no-tax campaign and Sathyagraha movement. I sound a note of warning with grave concern to our Prime Minister, our Home Minister Pantji and the Central Government and the Parliament once again not to speak of even those 'Minor Boundary Adjustments'. A casual reference of this phrase in the course of his reply to Parliament has been made use of by our Marathi speaking people and their representatives and will be liable to be made use of by other States in the near future as is being noticed by us in several other States. I say here, the definition of the phrase is enshrined in mystery and nobody, nowhere has defined this phrase. I do not know the height, weight or physical structure and features of this mysterious person Mr. Minor Boundary Adjustments. I, therefore, request the Central Government and Parliament to see that phrase is wiped off from all their books and procedures and conversational talks which go to form extractual quotations by fanatic leaders.

Sri Nijalingappaji in the course of his speech on this issue referred to and said that it is an objectionable attitude on the part of my Marathi speaking friends who are carrying on this violent agitation.

But I would like to say that it is not only an objectionable attitude but anti-social, anti-national and anti-Constitutional and their claim is unreasonable and unwarranted and baseless and such an attitude should be deprecated at all costs. With these words and observations I tell my Marathi speaking people and their representatives in this Legislature. Let them urge more and more in terms of educational facilities to their children, and other concessions. They are bound to get them all and it is a sacred duty

(SRI M. MALLIKARJUNASWAMY)

cast on the State to safeguard the interests of the minorities. With these observations, I close my speech.

7-00 P.M.

†ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಶರಣಗೌಡ (ಜೀವರಗಿ).—Mr. Speaker Sir, ಇಲ್ಲಿಯವರೆಗೂ ಅನೇಕ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಮಾತನಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಈಗ ಈ ಗೊತ್ತುವಳಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಎರಡು ಸಮಸ್ಯೆಗಳು ನಮ್ಮ ಮುಂದೆ ಬರುತ್ತಾ ಇವೆ. ಒಂದು, ಎನೆಂದರೆ ಈ ಸಮಸ್ಯೆಯನ್ನು ಪುನಃ ಕೇಂದ್ರ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ತೆರೆಯಬಾರದು ಅಥವಾ ಎತ್ತ ಬಾರದು ಎಂದು. ಈಗ ಒಮ್ಮೆ ಪಾರ್ಲಿಮೆಂಟಿನ ಆಕ್ಷೇಪಿಸಿದ ಈ ಸಮಸ್ಯೆ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಹಂದುಕೊಗಿದ ಪುನಃ ಮತ್ತೆ ಇದನ್ನು ಯಾವ ರೀತಿಯಿಂದಾದರೂ ಪರ್ಯಾಯೋಪಾಯ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶಕೊಡಬಾರದು. ಆದರೆ ಜೊತೆಗೆ ಲ್ಲ ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಏನಾದರೂ ಈ ಸಮಸ್ಯೆ ೨ ರಾಜ್ಯಗಳಿಂದ ಅಥವಾ ಆಯಾ ರಾಜ್ಯಗಳ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಒಪ್ಪಿಗೆಯಿಂದ ಸರಿಪಡಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಾಧ್ಯವಿದ್ದರೆ ಆ ರೀತಿ ಸರಿಗೊಳಿಸಬಹುದೆಂಬಂತವನ್ನೂ ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ತಿಳಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇಲ್ಲಿಯವರೆಗೂ ಅನೇಕ ಮಹನೀಯರು ಸಮರ್ಥನಮಾಡುವಾಗ, ಎರೋಧ ಮಾಡುವಾಗ ತಂತಮ್ಮ ವಿಚಾರಗಳನ್ನು ವ್ಯಕ್ತಪಡಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ನಾವು ಪುನಃ ಅವೇ ಸಮಸ್ಯೆಗಳನ್ನಾಗಲಿ ಅವರ ವಿಚಾರಗಳನ್ನಾಗಲಿ ಪ್ರಸ್ತಾಪಿಸಿ ಅದೇ ನನ್ನ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿ ತಮ್ಮ ವೇಳೆಯನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಇಷ್ಟಪಡುತ್ತಾ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಈಗ ಒಂದು ಮಾತನ್ನು ಮಾತ್ರ ಈ ನಿರ್ಣಯವನ್ನು ಮಂಡಿಸಿದವರೂ ಕೂಡ ಹೇಳಿಲ್ಲ ಮತ್ತು ಇತರ ಕೆಲವು ಸದಸ್ಯರುಗಳೂ ಕೂಡ ಹೇಳಿಲ್ಲ. Minor adjustment ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆನ್ನುವ ವಿಚಾರ ಹೇಳಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಏಕೆಂದರೆ ಕೇಂದ್ರ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಬೊಂಬಾಯಿ ರಾಜ್ಯವನ್ನು ನಾಳೆ ಗುಜರಾತ್ ಮತ್ತು ಮಹಾರಾಷ್ಟ್ರ ವಿಭಾಗ ಮಾಡಿದ ಅನಂತರ, Western Zonal Council ಹೋದ ಅನಂತರ ಈ ಸಮಸ್ಯೆ ಕೇಂದ್ರ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಗವಾನಕ್ಕೆ ಹೋಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಹಾಗೆ ಹೋದ ಪಕ್ಷದಲ್ಲಿ ಪುನಃ ಕೇಂದ್ರ ಸರ್ಕಾರ, ನಮ್ಮ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಜೊತೆಗೆ, ಮತ್ತು ಮಹಾರಾಷ್ಟ್ರ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಜೊತೆಗೆ ಮಾತುಕತೆ ನಡೆಸಿದಾಗ ಯಾವ ತಳಹದಿಯನ್ನಿಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡು, minor adjustment ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆನ್ನುವ ಸಮಸ್ಯೆ ಬಂದಾಗ ವಿಚಾರಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕಿಂತ ಮುಂಚಿತವಾಗಿಯೇ ಈಗಲೇ ಇದರ ಜೊತೆಗೆ ಹೇಳಿ ಬಿಡಬಹುದಾಗಿತ್ತು. ಏಕೆಂದರೆ ಮಹಾರಾಷ್ಟ್ರದ ಜೊತೆಗೆ ನಾವು ಯಾವುದಾದರೂ minor adjustment ಮಾಡುವಾಗ ಯಾವ ಒಂದು ತಳಹದಿಯನ್ನಿಟ್ಟುಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇವೆಯೋ ಅದೇ ಆಂಧ್ರ ಮತ್ತು ತಮಿಳು ಪ್ರಾಂತಕ್ಕೂ ಅನ್ವಯಿಸುತ್ತದೆ. ಆ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ನಾವು ವಿಲೇವಾರಿ ಯೂನಿಟಿ ಎಂದು ಇಟ್ಟುಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇವೆಯೋ ಅಥವಾ ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು ಯೂನಿಟಿ ಎಂದು ಇಟ್ಟುಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇವೆಯೋ ಎಂಬ ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ಇವೊತ್ತು ತಿಳಿಸಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಇದು ಇವೊತ್ತಿ ನ ದಿವಸ ನಮ್ಮ ಚರ್ಚೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಸ್ಪಷ್ಟವಾಗಿ ಹೊರಬೀಳಬೇಕು ಮತ್ತು ಈ ಸಮಸ್ಯೆಯನ್ನು ಇದೇ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ನಾವು ವಿಚಾರ ಮಾಡಬಾರದು ಎಂದು ನನಗಾದರೂ ಅನಿಸುತ್ತದೆ. ಈ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆನ್ನುವ ವಿಚಾರವನ್ನು ಈ ಮೂರು ವರ್ಷಗಳಿಂದ ಹೇಳಿಲ್ಲ.

ಬೊಂಬಾಯಿ ಸ್ಟೇಟ್ ಆಗಲಿ, ಮೈಸೂರು ಸ್ಟೇಟ್ ಆಗಲಿ ಅಥವಾ ಕೇಂದ್ರ ಸರ್ಕಾರವೇ ಆಗಲಿ, ಅಥವಾ ಇವೊತ್ತು ದೇಶ ಆಳುವಂತಹ ಪಕ್ಷದ ಮುಖಂಡರಾಗಲಿ ಯಾವುದಾದರೂ ಒಂದು ಸಮಾಧಾನಕರವಾದ ನೂತನ ತಂದು, ಈ ರೀತಿಯಿಂದ ಸಮಾಧಾನ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾ ಇದ್ದಾರೆಯೇ? ಇಲ್ಲಿಯವರೆಗೂ ಸಮಾಧಾನವಾಗಿದ್ದಿಲ್ಲ.

ಈ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಯ ಸಂಬಂಧದಲ್ಲಿ ಮುಂಬಯಿ ರಾಜ್ಯದ ಜನರಾಗಲಿ ಬೆಳಗಾಂವ್, ಬೀದರ್ ಜಿಲ್ಲೆಗಳ ಜನರಾಗಲಿ ಆಪ್ತೇ ಹೊಣೆಗಾರರು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದು ಕಾಗುವದಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದರೆ ಇನ್ನೂ ಬಹಳ ಜನರು ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಹೊಣೆಗಾರರಾಗಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಮುಂಬಯಿ ರಾಜ್ಯದಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ಕಾಂಗ್ರೆಸ್ ಸರಕಾರ ಅಸ್ತಿತ್ವದಲ್ಲಿದೆ. ಅದೇ ರೀತಿಯಾಗಿ ಮೈಸೂರು ರಾಜ್ಯದಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ಕಾಂಗ್ರೆಸ್ ಸರಕಾರವೇ ಇದೆ, ಹೀಗಿರುವಾಗ ಎರಡೂ ರಾಜ್ಯಗಳ ಮುಖಂಡರುಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ಹೊಂದಾಣಿಕೆಯಿಲ್ಲದೆ ಈ ಮಾತುಕತೆಗಳು ಇಲ್ಲಿಯವರೆಗೆ ನಡೆಯುತ್ತಾ ಇರುವುದು ಮತ್ತು ಕೇಂದ್ರ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಕಣ್ಣಿ ಕಿವಿಮುಚ್ಚಿಕೊಂಡು ಕುಳಿತಿರುವುದು ವಿಷಾದಕರ. ಈ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಯನ್ನು ನಮ್ಮ ಕೈಯಿಂದ ಬಗೆಹರಿಸಲು ಸಾಧ್ಯವಾಗದೆ, ಏನಾಕಾರಣವಾಗಿ ಅಲ್ಲಿಯ ಜನರನ್ನು ಗೋಳಿಗೆ ಈಡು ಮಾಡಲಾಗುತ್ತಿದೆ. ಇದು ತೀರ ವಿಷಾದಕರವಾದುದು. ಈ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಯ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಏನನ್ನಾದರೂ ಹೇಳಬಿಡುವುದು ಸುಲಭ. ಆದರೆ ನಿಜವಾಗಿ ಏನಾಗುತ್ತಿದೆ ಎಂದರೆ ಬೀದರ್, ಬೆಳಗಾಂವ್, ಕಾರವಾರ ಜಿಲ್ಲೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿಯ ಜನರು ದುರಂತಕ್ಕೆ ಒಳಗಾಗಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇದನ್ನು ನಾವು ವಿಚಾರಮಾಡಿ ನೋಡಿದರೆ ನಮಗೆ ಬಹಳ ಸಂಕಟವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಜನರು ಬಹಳ ಕಷ್ಟಕ್ಕೆ ಗುರಿಯಾಗಿದ್ದಾರೆ, ಇವೊತ್ತಿನ ದಿವಸ ಪ್ರಜೆಗಳ ಅಸ್ತಿತ್ವವನ್ನೂ ಜೀವ ರಕ್ಷಣೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾದ ಹೊಣೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಮೇಲೆ ಇದೆ. ಆದರೆ ಇದು ಒಬ್ಬ ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯ ಪ್ರಜೆಯ ನಿತ್ಯ ಜೀವಿತಕ್ಕೆ ಅಪಭಾತ ಉಂಟಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಈ ಚಳವಳಿಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಸತ್ಯಾಗ್ರಹ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇವೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾ ಮುಂಬಯಿ ರಾಜ್ಯದಿಂದ ಕೆಲವು ಜನರು ಬಂದೂಕು ರಿವಾಲ್ವರ್ ಲೈಸೆನ್ಸ್ ಇಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡು ನಮ್ಮ ರಾಜ್ಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಬರುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಈ ರೀತಿ ಹಿಂಸಾಚರಣೆಗೆ ಬರುತ್ತಿರುವ ಜನರಿಗೆ ಸರಕಾರ ಹೇಗೆ ಆಸ್ಪದಕೊಡುತ್ತಿದೆ? ಅಲ್ಲಲ್ಲಿ ಸತ್ಯಾಗ್ರಹ ಕ ಗ ಕ ಕಾಂವ್ ಮಾಡಿ ಈ ಜನರು ತಮ್ಮ ಚಟುವಟಿಕೆಗಳನ್ನು ನಡೆಸುತ್ತಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಗರಾಟೆಯಾಗುವುದು ಖಂಡಿತ ತಪ್ಪಿದ್ದಲ್ಲ. ಮುಂಬಯಿ ರಾಜ್ಯದ ಸರಕಾರವೂ ಇದೆ, ಮೈಸೂರು ಸರಕಾರವೂ ಇದೆ, ಆದರೂ ಸಹ ಗರಾಟೆ ನಡೆಯುತ್ತಿದೆ. ಇದರಿಂದ ಸರಕಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಪಾರ್ಟಿ ಡಿಸಿಪ್ಲಿನ್ ಮೇಲೆ ಕೆಲಸ ನಡೆಯುತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ನನಗೆ ಎನಿಸುತ್ತದೆ. ಈ ಭಾಷಾವಾರು ಪ್ರಾಂತ ರಚನೆಯ ಚಳವಳಿಯು 1920ರಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರಾರಂಭವಾದುದು 1953ರವರೆಗೂ ಪರಸ್ಪರರಲ್ಲಿ ಹೊಂದಾಣಿಕೆಯುಂಟಾಗಿ ಬಗೆಹರಿದಿಲ್ಲ. ಈ ಮೊದಲೇ ಇದನ್ನು ಬಗೆಹರಿಸಬೇಕಾಗಿತ್ತು. ಕೆಲವು ಸಮಸ್ಯೆಗಳು ಇನ್ನೂವರೆಗೆ ಹಾಗೆಯೇ ಉಳಿದಿವೆ. ಇಂಥ ಸಮಸ್ಯೆಗಳನ್ನು ಬಗೆಹರಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಸರಕಾರಗಳು, ಮುಖಂಡರಾಗಿರತಕ್ಕಂಥವರು, ಬೇರೆ ಬೇರೆ ಪ್ರಮುಖ ರಾಜಕೀಯ ಪಕ್ಷಗಳ ಮುಖಂಡರುಗಳನ್ನು ಕೂಡಿಸಿ ಕುಳಿತುಕೊಂಡು ಒಂದು ನೂಕುವಾದ ಯೋಜನೆಯನ್ನು ಎಲ್ಲ ಜನರೂ ಒಪ್ಪತಕ್ಕಂಥ ತಳಹದಿಯನ್ನು ನಿರ್ಧರಿಸಿ ಆ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಈ ಸಮಸ್ಯೆಗಳನ್ನು ಬಗೆಹರಿಸಬೇಕಾ

ಗಿತ್ತು. ಕೆಲವು ಜನರು ಹಳ್ಳಿಯನ್ನೇ ಘಟಕವಾಗಿ ಹಿಡಿದು ಬೇರೆ ಕೆಲವು ಹಳ್ಳಿಗಳನ್ನೇ ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಮುಖ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಇದನ್ನೇ ತಳಹದಿಯಾಗಿ ಇಟ್ಟು ಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಹೀಗೆ ಅವರು ಹೇಳಬಾರದು, ಏಕೆಂದರೆ ಇನ್ನುಳಿದ ಅನೇಕ ಜನರು ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು, ಫಿರ್ಕಾ ಅಥವಾ ಜಿಲ್ಲೆಯನ್ನೇ ಒಂದು ಯೂನಿಟನ್ನಾಗಿ ಪರಿಗಣಿಸಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ, ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಈ ರೀತಿ ಮಾಡುವುದು ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದೆಂದು ಕೆಲವರ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವಾಗಿದೆ. ಏಕೆಂದರೆ ಭಾಷಾನುಗುಣವಾಗಿ ಪ್ರಾಂತಗಳನ್ನು ವಿಂಗಡಣೆ ಮಾಡಬಾರದು; ಆದರೆ ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಈ ಸಮಸ್ಯೆಯನ್ನು ನೋಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆದರೆ ಈ ಸಮಸ್ಯೆಯನ್ನು ಏಕೆ ಬಗೆಹರಿಸಲಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ನಾನು ಕೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ರೋನರ್ ಕೌನ್ಸಿಲ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ಸಹ ಈ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಯನ್ನು ಅಲ್ಲಿಗೆಯೇ ಬಿಟ್ಟು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮುಖ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಬೇಕಾದಷ್ಟು ಪತ್ರವ್ಯವಹಾರ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆದರೂ ಸಹ ಯಾವುದೊಂದು ನಿರ್ಣಯಕ್ಕೆ ಬಂದಿಲ್ಲ. ಒಂದು ನಿರ್ಣಯಕ್ಕೆ ಬರಬೇಕಾಗಿತ್ತು. ದೇಶದ ಮುಂದೆ ತಮ್ಮ ಸ್ಪಷ್ಟ ವಿಚಾರಗಳನ್ನು ಇಡಬೇಕಾಗಿತ್ತು. ಈ ರೀತಿ ಮಾಡದೇ ಇರುವ ಮೂಲಕ ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ಸಮಾಧಾನಕಾರಕವಾದ ವಾತಾವರಣ ಉಂಟಾಗಿಲ್ಲ. ಮುಂಬಯಿಯ ಅಸೆಂಬ್ಲಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ನಿರ್ಣಯವನ್ನು ಪಾಸ್ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಮೈಸೂರು ಅಸೆಂಬ್ಲಿಯಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ಒಂದು ನಿರ್ಣಯ ಮಾಡಿ ಕೇಂದ್ರ ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಕಳುಹಿಸಿದರೆ, ಕೇಂದ್ರ ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಯಾವುದೇ ಒಂದು ಸ್ಪಷ್ಟ ಚಿತ್ರ ಬಂದಂತಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಅದುದರಿಂದ ಈಗ ಮಾದಾತಿರುವುದನ್ನು ಬಿಟ್ಟು ಬಿಡಬೇಕಾಗಿತ್ತು. ಈ ಸಮಸ್ಯೆಯನ್ನು 1962ರಲ್ಲಿ ಆಗತಕ್ಕ ಸಾರ್ವತ್ರಿಕ ಚುನಾವಣೆಯವರೆಗೆ ಬಿಟ್ಟು ಬಿಡಬಹುದು, ಯಾವುದೇ ಒಂದು ಸಮಸ್ಯೆಯನ್ನು ಧೈರ್ಯದಿಂದ ಒಳ್ಳೆಯ ಮಾರ್ಗದಿಂದ ಬಿಡಿಸಿ, ಮುಂದಕ್ಕೆ ಹಾಕುತ್ತಾ ಹೋದರೆ ಅದನ್ನು ಬಗೆಹರಿಸಿದಂತಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಇಂಥ ಸಮಸ್ಯೆಗಳನ್ನು ಪರಿಹರಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಸತ್ಯಾಗ್ರಹ ಮಾಡುವುದು, ಒಬ್ಬರು ಟ್ಯಾಕ್ಸ್ ಕೊಡಬೇಡಿ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದು, ತಿಕ್ಕಾಟ ಪ್ರಾರಂಭ ಮಾಡುವುದು ಇಂಥ ಕಾರ್ಯಗಳಿಂದ ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯ ಜನರಿಗೆ, ಶಾಂತಿಯುತ ಪ್ರಜೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಎಷ್ಟು ತೊಂದರೆಯಾಗುತ್ತಿದೆ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ವಿಚಾರ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ನಿಜವಾಗಿಯೂ ಹೇಳಬೇಕಾದರೆ ಗಡಿ ಪ್ರದೇಶದಲ್ಲರಂತಹ ಜನರಿಗೆ ಈ ಸಮಸ್ಯೆಯ ಸಂಬಂಧವೇ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಅಲ್ಲಿಯ ಜನರಿಗೆ ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ರಾಜ್ಯವಿದ್ದರೂ ಅಷ್ಟೇ ಯಾವ ಸರಕಾರವಿದ್ದರೂ ಅಷ್ಟೇ. ಏಕೆಂದರೆ ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯ ಪ್ರಜೆಯಾಗಿರುವವರಿಗೆ ರಾಗಿ ಬೇಸು ವುದು ತಪ್ಪಿದ್ದಲ್ಲ ಎಂಬಂತಾಗಿದೆ. ಈ ಚಳವಳಿ ನಡೆಸತಕ್ಕ ಜನರ ಮೆರವಣಿಗೆಗಾಗಲಿ ಸಭೆಗಾಗಲಿ ಬರತಕ್ಕ ಜನರ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ ಬಹಳ ಕಡಿಮೆ ಇದೆ. ಈ ಕರನಿರಾಕರಣ ಚಳವಳಿ ಸಭೆ, ಮೆರವಣಿಗೆ ಮುಂತಾದುವುಗಳನ್ನು ಒಪ್ಪದೇ ಇರತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಜನರು ಅಸಂಖ್ಯಾತರಾಗಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅಲ್ಲಿಯ ಜನರು ಮನೆ, ಭೂಮಿ, ಅಸ್ತಿ, ಜೀವನದ ಮೇಲೆ ಒಂದು ರೀತಿಯ ಅನ್ಯಾಯವಾಗುತ್ತಿದೆ. ಈ ರೀತಿಯಾಗುವ ಅನ್ಯಾಯವನ್ನು ತಡೆಗಟ್ಟಬೇಕು. ಇಂಥ ನಿರ್ಣಯವನ್ನು ಪಾಸ್ ಮಾಡುವುದರಿಂದ ಅದು ಸಾಧ್ಯವಾಗಲಾರದು. ಏನಾದರೂ ಒಂದು ಖಾಯಂ ಸ್ವರೂಪದ ನಿರ್ಣಯವನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕು, ಹಳ್ಳಿಯೇ ಒಂದು ಯೂನಿಟ ಆಗಿರಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದನ್ನು ಒಪ್ಪುವುದಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರೆ ಬಂಧಿತವಾಗಿಯೂ ಈ ಸಮಸ್ಯೆ ಬಗೆ

ಹರಿಯುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. 814 ಹಳ್ಳಿಗಳು ಮಹಾರಾಷ್ಟ್ರಕ್ಕೆ ಬರಬೇಕು, 260 ಹಳ್ಳಿಗಳು ಮೈಸೂರಿಗೆ ಹಿಂತಿರುಗಿಕೊಡಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಮುಂತಾಗಿ ಮುಂಬಯಿ ಮುಖ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಯಾವ ಬೇಸಿಸ್ ಅಂದರೆ ಆಧಾರ, ತಳಹದಿಯ ಮೇಲೆ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ? 260 ಹಳ್ಳಿಗಳಷ್ಟೇ ಮೈಸೂರಿಗೆ ಬರತಕ್ಕವುಗಳು ಎಂದು ಹೀಗೆ ಬೇರೆಯಾರೂ ಹೇಳಿಲ್ಲವಲ್ಲ. ಆದಕಾರಣ ಅವರು ಈ ರೀತಿ ಹೇಳಬಾರದಾಗಿತ್ತು. ಯಾವ ರೀತಿಯಾಗಿ ಮುಂಬಯಿ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು 814 ಹಳ್ಳಿಗಳು ತಮಗೆ ಬರತಕ್ಕವುಗಳಾಗಿವೆ, 260 ಹಳ್ಳಿಗಳು ಮೈಸೂರಿಗೆ ಹೋಗತಕ್ಕವುಗಳಾಗಿವೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿ ಆಯಾ ಪ್ರದೇಶದ ನಕಾಶೆಗಳನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದು ಜನತೆಯ ಮುಂದೆ ಇಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆಯೋ ಅದೇ ಪ್ರಕಾರವಾಗಿ ಮೈಸೂರಿನ ಮುಖಂಡರೂ ಸಹ ನಕಾಶೆಗಳನ್ನು ತಯಾರಿಸಿ ಎಂಟು ನೂರು ಹಳ್ಳಿಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಕೇವಲ ಇನ್ನೂರು ಹಳ್ಳಿಗಳು ಮಾತ್ರ ಬದಲಾವಣೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂಬುದಾಗಿ, ಎಷ್ಟೆಷ್ಟು ಹಳ್ಳಿಗಳು ಎನ್ನುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಒಂದು ಸೆನ್ಸಿಟಿವ್ ಆಗಿ ಮ್ಯಾಪ್ ಕೊಟ್ಟು ಜನರಿಗೆ ಏಕೆ ಎಚ್ಚರಿಕೆ ಕೊಡಬಾರದು? ಇಷ್ಟು ಹಳ್ಳಿಗಳು ಬರುತ್ತವೆ ಎಂದು ಚಳವಳಿ ಮತ್ತು ಗರಾಜೆ ನಡೆಸಿರುವ ಪ್ರದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಜನರಿಗೆ ಏಕೆ ತೀವ್ರವಾಗಿ ಕೊಡಬಾರದು? ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಎಲ್ಲವನ್ನೂ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇವೆ, ನೀವು ಶಾಂತ ರೀತಿಯಿಂದ ಇರಬೇಕು ಇದು ನಿಜವಾಗಿಯೂ; ಹದರಿಕೆ ಬೆದರಿಕೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಬಗ್ಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ತೀವ್ರ ಬೇಕಾಗಿತ್ತು. ಸಮಾಧಾನಕರವಾದ ನೂಚನೆಗಳನ್ನು ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಪರಿಶೀಲಿಸುತ್ತಿದೆ ಎಂದು ಜನರಿಗೆ ತಿಳಿಸಬೇಕಾಗಿತ್ತು. ಈ ಸಮಸ್ಯೆಯನ್ನು ಬಗೆಹರಿಸಲು ನಾವು ಸರ್ವಶಕ್ತಿಯನ್ನು ಉಪಯೋಗಿಸುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇವೆಂದು ಜನರಿಗೆ ತಿಳಿಸಬೇಕಾಗಿತ್ತು ಎಂದು ನನಗೆ ಎನಿಸುತ್ತದೆ. ಮೆರವಣಿಗೆ ತೆಗೆಯಬಾರದು, ಪೊಲೀಸ್ ಮಾಡಬಾರದು, ಅವುಗಳನ್ನು ತಡೆಹಿಡಿಯಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ತೀಳುವುದು ಆಗತಕ್ಕವಾಗಿತ್ತು. ಪೊಲೀಸ್ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳು ಹೋಗಿ ಕಂದಾಯ ವಸೂಲಿ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡು ಬರತಕ್ಕ ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿ ಉಂಟಾಗುತ್ತಿರಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಈ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಒಂದು realistic view ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕಾಗಿತ್ತು. ಕಂದಾಯ ಕೊಡುವ ರೈತರಿಗೆ ಸುಖತೆಯ ಭಯ ಉಂಟಾಗಿದೆ. ಈ ರೀತಿ ಭಯವುಂಟಾಗುವುದನ್ನು ತಪ್ಪಿಸಬೇಕು. ಈ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ facts and figures ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಎಲ್ಲರ ಮುಂದೆ ಇಡಬಹುದಾಗಿತ್ತು. ಈ ರೀತಿ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದರೆ ಸನಿವೇಶ ಹೀಗೆ ಆಗುತ್ತಿರಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಜವಾಬ್ದಾರಿ ಸ್ಥಾನದಲ್ಲಿರುವವರು ಇಂಥದೊಂದು statement ಕೊಡುವ ಹೊರತು ಈ ಸಮಸ್ಯೆ ಬಗೆಹರಿಸುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಮಹಾರಾಷ್ಟ್ರಕ್ಕೆ ಸೇರಬೇಕಾದ ಪ್ರದೇಶ ಮಹಾರಾಷ್ಟ್ರಕ್ಕೆ ಹೋಗಿಯೇ ಹೋಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಕರ್ನಾಟಕದಲ್ಲರಬೇಕಾದ ಪ್ರದೇಶ ಕರ್ನಾಟಕದಲ್ಲೇ ಇರುತ್ತದೆ. ಹೀಗಾಗುವುದನ್ನು ಯಾರಿಗೂ ತಪ್ಪಿಸಲೆಸೆಯಲಾಗದು.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ನಿರ್ಣಯವನ್ನು ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿ ಓದಿ ನೋಡಬೇಕು. Minor adjustment ಅಥವಾ major adjustment ಇವುಗಳಲ್ಲ ಯಾವುದು ಆಗಬೇಕೆಂದು ನೀವು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೀರಿ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಶರಣಗೌಡ.—ಈ ದಿವಸ ಜನರ ಅಪೇಕ್ಷೆ ತೀವ್ರವಾಗಿದೆ ಮುಂದುವರಿಯಬೇಕು. 800 ಗ್ರಾಮಗಳನ್ನು ಬಿಟ್ಟುಕೊಟ್ಟು 200 ಗ್ರಾಮಗಳನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದು ಉಚಿತವಲ್ಲ. ಕೊಡುವುದು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದು ಇರುವಾಗ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಜನಾಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ ಪಡೆಯಬೇಕು. ಎರಡು ವರ್ಷ ದೇಶವಾಂಛೆಯವರು

(ಶ್ರೀ ಎಚ್. ಕೆ. ವೀರಣ್ಣಗೌಡ)

ಪಾಟೀಲರು ನಾವೂ ಕೂಡಿ ಹೈದರಾಬಾದ್ ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನದಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಬೇದರ್ ಮತ್ತು ಗುಲ್ಬರ್ಗ ಜಿಲ್ಲೆಗಳ ಕೆಲವು ಭಾಗಗಳು ತೆಲಂಗಾಣಕ್ಕೆ ಹೋಗಿ ಬೇಕಾಗಿತ್ತು. ಈಗ ಬೇದರ್ ಮೈಸೂರಿಗೆ ಸೇರಿದೆ. ಕೆಲವು ಕಡೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಮಂದಿ ಮರಾಠಿ ಮಾತನಾಡುವವರು ಅಥವಾ ಕನ್ನಡ ಮಾತನಾಡುವವರು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಸರಿಯಾದ ಅಂಕಿ ಅಂಶಗಳಿಲ್ಲದೆ ಹೈದರಾಬಾದಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ವಿಷಯ ಚರ್ಚೆಯಾಗಿದೆ. 1951ರ ಅಂಕಿ ಅಂಶಗಳು ಮಾತ್ರ ಇವೆ. ಅದೋಣಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಕನ್ನಡ ಮಾತನಾಡುವವರಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅದೇ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಭಿಲ್ಮಾ ಮತ್ತು ಸಂತಾಪುರಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಮರಾಠಿ ಮಾತನಾಡುವವರು ಹೆಚ್ಚಾಗಿಲ್ಲ. ಇರುವ ಅಂಕಿ ಅಂಶಗಳ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಮರಾಠಿ ಭಾಷೆ ಮಾತನಾಡುವವರ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ ಶೇಕಡ 40 ಕ್ಕಿಂತ ಕಡಮೆಯಿದೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಕೆಲವು ಭಾಗಗಳನ್ನು ಮೈಸೂರಿಗೆ ಸೇರಿಸಿದೆ. ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಮೇಲೆ ದೊಡ್ಡ ಜವಾಬ್ದಾರಿಯಿದೆ. ಈಗಿರುವ ಸಮಸ್ಯೆಯನ್ನು ಸರಿಯಾದ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಬಗೆಹರಿಸಬೇಕು. ಈ ದಿವಸ ಅನಂತಮುಖ್ಯ ವಾತಾವರಣವಿದೆ. ದೇಶದ ಜನರ ಸಮಸ್ಯೆ ಮತ್ತು ಆಡಳಿತದ ಸಮಸ್ಯೆಗಳನ್ನು ಪರಿಣಾಮಕಾರಿಯಾದ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಇತ್ಯರ್ಥಪಡಿಸಬೇಕು. ರಂಗೂನ್, ಮಲೆಯಾಳ ಮುಂತಾದ ಕಡೆ ಅಲ್ಪ ಸಂಖ್ಯಾತರಿದ್ದಾರೆ, ಅಲ್ಪ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಯೋಗ್ಯ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ರಕ್ಷಣೆ ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ರಾಜ್ಯಾಂಗ ರೀತ್ಯಾ ಅವರು ತಮ್ಮ ಹಕ್ಕನ್ನು ಪಡೆಯಲು ಪ್ರಯತ್ನಿಸುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಈ ದಿನ ಆಫ್ರಿಕಾದಲ್ಲೂ ಅದೇ ರೀತಿ ಆಗುತ್ತಿದೆ. ಅಲ್ಪ ಹೀಗೆ ಗೊಂದಲ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ. ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಗಂಭೀರವಾದುದು ಬಹಳ ಬಂದನೀಯ. ಶಾಂತರೀತಿಯಿಂದ ಹಕ್ಕನ್ನು ಬೇಡಲಿ, ಒಂದು ಆರ್ಗನೈಜೇಷನ್ ಮಾಡಿ ಕೊಂಡು ತಮ್ಮ ಹಕ್ಕುಗಳನ್ನು ಮುಂದಿಡಲಿ. ಮಹಾರಾಷ್ಟ್ರದವರು ಕೊಲ್ಹಾಪುರ ಅಥವಾ ಬೇರೆ ಕಡೆ ಕ್ಯಾಂಪ್ ಮಾಡಿ ಮೈಸೂರಿಗೆ ಬಂದು ಗಲಾಟೆ ಮಾಡುವುದನ್ನು ಮುಂಬಯಿ ಮುಖ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಕಣ್ಣಿಗಿಟ್ಟು ನೋಡುತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ. ನಮ್ಮ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಪತ್ರಿಕೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಗಡಿ ವಿವಾದದ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಸುದ್ದಿಗಳು ಬಂದಾಗ ಮುಂಬಯಿ ಸರ್ಕಾರದೊಡನೆ ಆಗಲಿ, ಕೇಂದ್ರ ಸರ್ಕಾರದೊಡನೆ ಆಗಲಿ ಪತ್ರವ್ಯವಹಾರ ಆ ಸಂಬಂಧವಾಗಿ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೋ ಇಲ್ಲವೋ ಗೊತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ; ಮಾಡಿದ್ದರೆ ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದು; ಮಾಡದಿದ್ದರೆ ಅದು ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲ. ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಈ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಗಮನಕೊಡದಿರುವುದು ಬಹಳ ಬಂದನೀಯ. ಪ್ರಜಾಪ್ರಭುತ್ವದಲ್ಲಿ ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯ ಜನಜೀವನದೊಂದಿಗೆ ಆಟವಾಡುವುದು ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲ. ನಮ್ಮ ಆಸ್ತಿಗೆ, ಜೀವಕ್ಕೆ ಏನು ಬೇರೆಯದೋ ಅಷ್ಟೇ ಬೇರೆ ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯ ಜನರ ಆಸ್ತಿಗೆ, ಜೀವಕ್ಕೆ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು. ನಮ್ಮ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಮುಂಬಯಿ ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಈ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಅಂಟಿಸೋಪಿಯಲ್ ಆಕ್ಟಿವಿಟೀಸ್ ನಡೆಯುತ್ತಿರುವುದನ್ನು ಅದಷ್ಟು ತಡೆಯಬೇಕೆಂದು ನೋಡಬೇಕು. ಈಗ ನಡೆಯುವ ಗಲಾಟೆಗೆ ಯಾರೂ ಬೆಂಬಲ ಕೊಡುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಈ ದಿವಸ ನಾವು ಯಾವ ಆಧಾರದ ಮೇಲೆ ಈಗ ಎದ್ದಿರುವ ಸಮಸ್ಯೆಯನ್ನು ಬಗೆಹರಿಸಬೇಕೆಂದು ಕೇಂದ್ರ ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಸ್ಪಷ್ಟಪಡಿಸದಿದ್ದರೆ ಮತ್ತೆ ಬೇರೆ ಸಮಸ್ಯೆಗಳು ಉಂಟಾಗಬಹುದು. ಮಹಾರಾಷ್ಟ್ರದ ಜೊತೆಗೆ ಅಂಧ, ಕೇರಳ ಅಥವಾ ತಮಿಳರ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲೂ ಇಂಥ ಸಮಸ್ಯೆಗಳು ಏಳಬಹುದು. ಫಿರೋಜ್ ಯೂನಿಟ್, ಫಿರ್ಕಾಯಿಲಿಟ್, ಅದಳ ದ ಅನುಕೂಲ ಅಥವಾ

ಎಕನಾಮಿಕ್ ಬೇಸಿಸ್ ಮುಂತಾದುವುಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾವ ಬೇಸಿಸ್ ಮೇಲೆ ಮೈಸೂರ್ ಅಡ್ಮಿನ್ ಮೆಂಟ್ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂಬುದನ್ನು ಸ್ಪಷ್ಟವಾಗಿ ಹೇಳಬೇಕು. ಅದನ್ನು ಹೇಳದೆ ಸುಮ್ಮನಿದ್ದರೆ ಈ ಸಮಸ್ಯೆ ಬಗೆಹರಿಯುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಈ ದಿವಸ ಮಹಾರಾಷ್ಟ್ರದಲ್ಲಿರುವವರು ಮೈಸೂರಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಗೊಂದಲ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇದನ್ನು ಕೇಂದ್ರ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಈ ಆಧಾರದ ಮೇಲೆ ಬಗೆಹರಿಸಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಧೈರ್ಯದಿಂದ ಸ್ಪಷ್ಟವಾಗಿ ಹೇಳಬೇಕು. ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದೆ ವಿಚಾರ ತಿಳಿಸಿ ಅದರ ಒಪ್ಪಿಗೆ ಪಡೆದು ಆಮೆರು ತೀರ್ಮಾನ ಕೈಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕು. ಟೀಕೆಗೆ ಅಥವಾ ಗಲಾಟೆಗೆ ಆಸ್ಪದ ಕೊಡಬಾರದು. ಈ ಎರಡು ಮಾತುಗಳನ್ನು ಹೇಳಿ ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದಿರುವ ನಿರ್ಣಯಕ್ಕೆ ಬೆಂಬಲ ಕೊಡುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೊಲ್ಲೂರು ಮಲ್ಲಪ್ಪ.—ಸಂತಪುರ ಎಂಬ ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು ಮೊದಲರಲ್ಲ; ಹೊಸದಾಗಿ ಮಾಡಿದರು.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಶರಣಗೌಡ.—ಭಾಲ್ಕು ಎಂದು ಮೊದಲಿತು. ಸಂತಪರ ನಮಗೆ ಸೇರುವಾಗ ದೇಶಪಾಂಡೆಯವರು, ಮುಂಬಯಿ ವಿರೋಧ ಪಕ್ಷದ ನಾಯಕರು, ಕಮ್ಯೂನಿಸ್ಟ್ ಪಕ್ಷದ ಮುಂಬಂಡರು ಯುನೈಟೆಡ್ ಫ್ರಂಟ್ ನಾಯಕನಾದ ನಾನು, ಮತ್ತು ಮುಖ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಚರ್ಚೆ ಮಾಡಿ ಶೇಕಡ 80 ಮಂದಿ ಯಾವ ಭಾಷೆಯನ್ನಾಡುವರೋ ಆ ಭಾಷೆಗೆ ಪ್ರಾಮುಖ್ಯತೆ ಕೊಡೋಣ, ಮುಂದೆ ತೊಂದರೆಯಾಗಬಾರದು ಎಂದು ತೀರ್ಮಾನಕ್ಕೆ ಬಂದೆವು. ಒಮ್ಮೆ ನಿರ್ಣಯ ಮಾಡಿದ ಮೇಲೆ ಅದು ಬಾಯಿಮಾಡಿರಬೇಕು; ಸಮಸ್ಯೆ ಬಗೆಹರಿಯುವಂತಿದ್ದರೆ ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದು. ಈ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಮಾಡುವುದು ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದೆಂದು ಅರಿಕೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇನೆ.

7-30 P.M.

(ಶ್ರೀ ಎಚ್. ಕೆ. ವೀರಣ್ಣಗೌಡ.—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರೇ, ನಾನು ಹತ್ತನೆಯ ತಾರೀಖು ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದೆ ಮಂಡಿಸಿದ ನಿರ್ಣಯಕ್ಕೆ ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸ್ನೇಹಿತರು ಈ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಯನ್ನು ಒಂದು ರಾಜಕೀಯ ಪಕ್ಷದ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಯನ್ನಾಗಿ ಭಾವಿಸದೆ, ಇದು ಒಂದು ದೇಶದ ಸಮಸ್ಯೆ, ಈ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಜನರ ಹಿತವನ್ನು ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಲ್ಲಿಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡು ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಗಮನವಲ್ಲಿಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡು ಬೆಂಬಲ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ನಾನು ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಸದಸ್ಯರುಗಳಿಗೂ ಕೃತಜ್ಞನಾಗಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಬಾಕಿ ವಿಚಾರಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ರಾಜಕೀಯ ಪಕ್ಷಗಳು ಭಿನ್ನಾಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ ಹೊಂದಿ, ಆಡಳಿತ ನಿರ್ವಹಿಸತಕ್ಕಂಥವನ್ನು ತಂದ ನಿರ್ಣಯಗಳಿಗೆ ಮತ್ತು ಸಲಹೆಗಳಿಗೆ ತಮ್ಮ ಪ್ರತಿಭಟನೆಯನ್ನೂ ಅಸಮ್ಮತಿಯನ್ನೂ ನೋಟಿಸುವುದು ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯವಾಗಿದ್ದರೂ ಸಹ, ಈ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಯನ್ನು ಈ ರೀತಿ ಭಾವಿಸಿರುವುದು ನನಗೆ ಬಹಳ ಸಂತೋಷ; ನನ್ನ ಸ್ನೇಹಿತರೆಲ್ಲರಿಗೂ ವಂದನೆಗಳನ್ನು ಅರ್ಪಿಸುತ್ತಾ ಇದ್ದೇನೆ.

ಸ್ವಾಭಾವಿಕವಾಗಿ, ಅದೇ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವನ್ನು ಮಹಾರಾಷ್ಟ್ರ ಏಕೀಕರಣ ಸಮಿತಿಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಹೊಂದದೆ ಇದ್ದರೆ, ಅಶ್ಚರ್ಯವೇನೂ ಅಲ್ಲ.

ಇವೊತ್ತು ನಡೆದ ಚರ್ಚೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ನಾನು ಉತ್ತರ ರೂಪವಾಗಿ ಹೇಳತಕ್ಕಂಥ, ಹೇಳಬೇಕಾದ ಅಂಶಗಳು ಅಷ್ಟಾಗಿ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಮುಖ್ಯವಾಗಿ ಒಂದೇ ಒಂದು ಅಂಶವನ್ನು ಅನೇಕ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಬಹುಮುಖ್ಯವಾಗಿ ಪ್ರಸ್ತಾಪ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ; “ಬೇರೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಇರತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಕನ್ನಡಿಗರ ಗತಿ ಏನು” ಎಂದಿಲ್ಲ; ಅದನ್ನು ಏಕೆ ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಸೇರಿಸಲಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಕೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಚರ್ಚೆ ನಡೆಯುತ್ತಿ-

MYSORE BORDER ADJUSTMENTS

ದ್ವಾಗ ಮಧ್ಯೆ ನಾನು ಹೇಳಿದಹಾಗೆ, ನಿರ್ಣಯದ ಮೇಲಿನ ಭಾಗದಲ್ಲಿ ಅಕಸ್ಮಾತ್ ಒಂದು ಪದ ಬಿಟ್ಟು ಹೋಗಿದ್ದೇ ಇಷ್ಟೆಲ್ಲಾ ಚರ್ಚೆಗೆ ಕಾರಣವಾಯಿತು ಎಂದು ಅಂದುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಬೊಂಬಾಯಿ ಮತ್ತು ಮೈಸೂರು ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನಗಳ ಗಡಿಯ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆ ಈಗಿರತಕ್ಕಂಥ ನಿರ್ಣಯಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟಿದೆ. ಇದನ್ನು ಹೊಸದಾಗಿ ನಾನು ಯೋಚನೆಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾಇಲ್ಲ. ಇದು ನಿರ್ಣಯದ ಎರಡನೆಯ ಪ್ಯಾರಾದಲ್ಲಿ ನಮೂದಾಗಿದೆ.

“This Assembly expresses its great concern at the repeated attempts made by certain elements from outside the State to foment trouble among the people of the Mysore-Bombay border area by continued unhealthy propaganda and consequent breaches of law and order.”

ಅದೇ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವೇ ಮೇಲಿನ ಪ್ಯಾರಾದಲ್ಲಿ ಸಹ ಇದ್ದಿರಬೇಕಾಗಿತ್ತು. ಅದು ಅಕಸ್ಮಾತ್ತಾಗಿ ಕೈಬಿಟ್ಟುಹೋಗಿದೆ. ಇದು ಇಂಥ ಸಮಸ್ಯೆ ಉಂಟಾಗುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಕಾರಣವಾಯಿತು. ಶ್ರೀ ನರಸಿಂಹ ಅವರು ಹೇಳಿದರು: “ಹಾಗೇ ಬೇರೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಒಂದು ಸಾರಿ ತೀರ್ಮಾನವಾಗಿರತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಗಡಿಯ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳನ್ನು ಎತ್ತಿಕೊಡದಂದರೆ, ಆಗ ಕನ್ನಡ ಮಾತನಾಡತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಬೇರೆಬೇರೆ ಗಡಿಗಳಲ್ಲಿರುವ ಅನೇಕ ಭಾಗದ ಕನ್ನಡಿಗರಿಗೆ ಅನ್ಯಾಯ ಮಾಡಿದ ಹಾಗೆ ಆಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲವೇ” ಎಂದು. ಯಾವ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಯನ್ನೇ ಆಗಲಿ ಚರ್ಚೆಮಾಡುವಾಗ ಎರಡು ಸರ್ಕಾರಗಳೂ ಒಪ್ಪಬೇಕೆಂದಿದೆ. ಒಂದುವೇಳೆ ದುರದೃಷ್ಟವಶಾತ್ ಎರಡು ಸರ್ಕಾರಗಳು ಯಾವ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಯ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿಯೇ ಆಗಲಿ ಒಪ್ಪದೆ ಇದ್ದರೆ, ಸ್ವಾಭಾವಿಕವಾಗಿ ಕಷ್ಟವಾಗಿ ಕಾಣುತ್ತದೆ. ಆದರೆ ನನಗೆ ಒಂದು ಆಲೋಚನೆ ಇದೆ. ಸಮಸ್ಯೆ ಬಿಡಿಸುವಾಗ, ವಾದವಿವಾದ ಮಾಡುವಾಗ ಯಾವ ಸರ್ಕಾರವೂ ನೆಲದಾಹದಿಂದ ಕೆಲಸಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದೆ ಎಂಬ ನಂಬಿಕೆ ನನಗಿಲ್ಲ. ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯವಾಗಿ ಜನಗಳ ಅನುಕೂಲ ಮತ್ತು ಆರೋಗ್ಯದ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ನಾವು ನೀವು ಮಾತನಾಡುವಾಗ ಬಹುಶಃ ಬೊಂಬಾಯಿ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರೂ ಸಹ ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಅಡ್ಡಿ ಬರಲಾರರೆಂದು ನನ್ನ ನಂಬಿಕೆ. ಇವೊತ್ತು ಬೊಂಬಾಯಿ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಹಳ್ಳಿಗಳ ಒಂದು ಪಟ್ಟಿಯನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಹಾಗೆಯೇ ಮೈಸೂರು ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಏಕೆ ಒಂದು ಪಟ್ಟಿಯನ್ನು ಮಾಡಲಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ತರಣಗೌಡರು ಕೇಳಿದರು. ಮೊದಲು ಒಂದು ತತ್ವಕ್ಕೆ ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಂಡರೆ, 100-200 ಗ್ರಾಮಗಳ ಪಟ್ಟಿಯನ್ನು, ಅದರಲ್ಲಿ ಸೇರಿಸಬಹುದಾದ ನಾಲ್ಕು ಐದುಲಕ್ಷ ಪ್ರಜೆಗಳ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆಯನ್ನು ಕೊಡುವುದೂ ದೊಡ್ಡ ವಿಚಾರವಲ್ಲ. ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯವಾಗಿ ಚರ್ಚೆಮಾಡಬೇಕಾದ ಅಂಶದ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಬೊಂಬಾಯಿ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯಕ್ಕೂ ಮೈಸೂರು ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯಕ್ಕೂ ವ್ಯತ್ಯಾಸ ಬಂದಿರುವುದರಿಂದ, ಈ ಒಂದು ವ್ಯತ್ಯಾಸ ಬಗೆಹರಿಯಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಸಂಧಾನ ಕ್ರಮವನ್ನು ಕೈಬಿಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೇವೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದಂತೆ ಆಗಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಮಹಾರಾಷ್ಟ್ರ ಏಕೀಕರಣ ಸಮಿತಿಯ ಸ್ನೇಹಿತರು ಅಥವಾ ಆಗುವಿಗೆ ಸೇರಿದ ಜನರು ಈ ಒಂದು ಸನ್ನಿವೇಶವನ್ನು ಮತ್ತು ಕೆಲವು ಭಿನ್ನಾಭಿಪ್ರಾಯಗಳನ್ನು ದುರಾಪ

ಯೋಗಪಡಿಸಿಕೊಂಡು ಒಂದು ಭಾಗದಲ್ಲಿ ಶಾಂತಿ ಭಂಗಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಹೊರಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಹೊರತು, ಸರ್ಕಾರಗಳು ಈ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಯನ್ನು ಬಿಡಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ನಮ್ಮಿಂದ ಆಗಲಿಲ್ಲ, ಕೈಬಿಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೇವೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ಭಾವಿಸಿಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಮೊನ್ನೆ ಬೊಂಬಾಯಿ ಶಾಸನಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ಅಲ್ಲಿನ ಮುಖ್ಯಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಒಂದು ನಿರ್ಣಯವನ್ನು ಮಂಡಿಸಿ ಮಾತನಾಡುತ್ತಿರುವಾಗಲೂ ಸಹ ನಮ್ಮ ಮುಖ್ಯಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳನ್ನು ಎರಡು ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನಗಳಿಗೂ ಇರುವ ಗಡಿ ಸಮಸ್ಯೆಯನ್ನು ಬಗೆಹರಿಸಲು ಸಹಕಾರ ನೀಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಕೇಳಿಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಈ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆ ಮುಗಿದು ಹೋಯಿತು ಎಂದು ಎರಡು ಸರ್ಕಾರಗಳೂ ಹೇಳಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದರೆ ಈ ಸನ್ನಿವೇಶವನ್ನು ಕೆಲವು ಸ್ನೇಹಿತರು ಉಪಯೋಗಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡು, ಒಪ್ಪುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಆಗದಿರತಕ್ಕಂಥ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಕಾರ್ಯಕ್ರಮಗಳನ್ನು ಕೈಗೊಂಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅದು ಬಹಳ ದುರದೃಷ್ಟವಾದಂಥ, ಬಹಳ ವ್ಯಸನಕರವಾದಂಥ ಸಂಗತಿಯಾಗಿದೆ. ಅದನ್ನು “ಬೇಡಿ, ಹಾಗೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಡಿ, ಇದು ತೀರ್ಮಾನವಾದ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಯಾಗಿದೆ” ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಮರಾಠಿಯವರಿಗೆ ಕನ್ನಡಿಗರು ತೊಂದರೆ ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆನ್ನುವುದು ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಉದ್ದೇಶವಲ್ಲ. ಇದಕ್ಕೋಸ್ಕರ ಸ್ವಾತಂತ್ರ್ಯ ಸಂಪಾದನೆ ಮಾಡಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಭಾಷಾವಾರು ಪ್ರಾಂತ್ಯ ರಚನೆ ಮಾಡಿದುದು ಜನಗಳಿಗೆ ತೊಂದರೆಯಾಗಲಿ ಎಂಬ ಉದ್ದೇಶದಿಂದಲ್ಲ. ಇತರ ಪ್ರದೇಶಗಳಲ್ಲಿರುವ ಕನ್ನಡ ಜನರು ಶಾಂತಿಭಂಗ ತರುವಂಥ ಮನೋಭಾವವನ್ನು ತಾಳಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಅವರು ಕನ್ನಡದೇಶಕ್ಕೆ ಸೇರಿಬೇಕಾದ ಪ್ರದೇಶಗಳ ವಿಚಾರವನ್ನು ಶಾಂತಿ ಮನೋಭಾವನೆಯಿಂದ ಚರ್ಚೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆದರೆ ನಮ್ಮ ಮಹಾರಾಷ್ಟ್ರ ಏಕೀಕರಣ ಸಮಿತಿಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಗಡಿ ಸಮಸ್ಯೆಯನ್ನು ಚರ್ಚೆ ಮಾಡುವಾಗ ಅದೇ ಮನೋಭಾವನೆಯನ್ನು ತಾಳಿಲ್ಲ; ನಾನಾ ವಿಧವಾದ ಕಾರ್ಯಕ್ರಮವನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅದು ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳಿದೆ. ಕೇಂದ್ರ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಗಟ್ಟಿ ಮನಸ್ಸಿನಿಂದ ಒಂದು ಸಾರಿ ತೀರ್ಮಾನಮಾಡಿರುವ ವಿಚಾರವನ್ನು ಕದಲಿಸಬೇಕಾದರೆ ಎರಡು ಸರ್ಕಾರಗಳು ಒಪ್ಪಿಗೆಗೆ ಬರಬೇಕು. ಹಾಗೆ ಒಪ್ಪಿಗೆಗೆ ಬರುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯಪಟ್ಟಿದ್ದರಿಂದ, ಬೊಂಬಾಯಿ ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೂ ಮೈಸೂರು ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೂ ನಡೆದಿರತಕ್ಕ ಮಾತುಕತೆಗಳು ನಿಂತುಹೋದವು. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಜನರು ಮನಸ್ಸಿಗೆ ಬಂದರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ನಡೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬಹುದೆಂದು ಅರ್ಥ ಬರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ.

ನಮ್ಮ ಸ್ನೇಹಿತರಾದ ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಸುನಂದ್ರಲಾಲ್ ಅವರು ‘ಬಹಳ ಶಾಂತತಾವರಣದಲ್ಲಿ ಕಾಣಿಸಿಟ್ಟುಪನರ್’ ಆಗಿ ಚಳುವಳಿ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇವೆ” ಎಂದು ಅಷ್ಟಣೆ ಕೊಡಿಸಿದರು. ಅವರು ತಮ್ಮ ಮನಸ್ಸಿಗೆ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆ ಹಾಕಿಕೊಳ್ಳಲಿ; ಬೆಳಗಾವಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ಸಭೆ ನಡೆಯುತ್ತಿರುವಾಗ ಅಲ್ಲಿಗೆ ಹೋದ ಕನ್ನಡಿಗರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಅವರು ಯಾವ ರೀತಿ ವರ್ತಿಸಿದರು, ಅದಿಕಾರಿಗಳು ತಂತಮ್ಮ ಕರ್ತವ್ಯವಾಲನೆಗಾಗಿ ಹೋಗುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾಗ ಗುಂಡುಹಾರಿಸಿದುದು ಶಾಂತಿಯ ಹಾದಿಯೆಂದು ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆ ಹಾಕಿಕೊಳ್ಳಲಿ. ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಕಂದಾಯ ಕೊಡುವುದಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದೇಕೆ? ಯಾವುದೋ ಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ, ಯಾವುದೋ ಸನ್ನಿವೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾತು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದನ್ನು ನಮಗೆ ನಾವೇ ತಿರುಗಿಸಿಕೊಂಡು ಶಾಂತಿಯಿಂದ ಚಳವಳಿ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇವೆಂದರೆ, ಇದು ಎಷ್ಟು ಮಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ಸರಿ ಎನ್ನುವುದನ್ನು ಅವರು ಊಹಿಸಬೇ

(ಶ್ರೀ ಎಚ್. ಕೆ. ವೀರಣ್ಣಗೌಡ)

ಮಲಗುವಾಗ ನಿದ್ರೆ ಬರುವುದಕ್ಕಿಂತ ಮುಂಚೆ ಯೋಚನೆಮಾಡಬೇಕು; ಆಗ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಅರ್ಥವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ, ತಾವು ಕೈಗೊಂಡಿರುವ ಕಾರ್ಯ ನ್ಯಾಯವಲ್ಲವೆಂಬುದು. ಬೆಳಗಾವಿನ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆ ಹಿಂದೆ ಇಂಗ್ಲೀಷರು ಅಡಳಿತ ನಡೆಸುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾಗ ಉದ್ಭವವಾಗಲಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಎ. ಎಸ್. ಪಾಟೀಲ್ ಅವರು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ನಾನು ಕೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ: ಆಗ ಬೆಳಗಾವಿ ಕನ್ನಡ ಪ್ರದೇಶವೆ ಅಥವಾ ಮರಾಠಿ ಪ್ರದೇಶವೆ ಎನ್ನುವುದು 'ಉದ್ಭವವಾಗದಿದ್ದರೆ 1925ರಲ್ಲಿ ಮರಾಠಿ ಸ್ನೇಹಿತರು ಸಾಹಿತ್ಯ ಸಮ್ಮೇಳನವನ್ನು ನಡೆಸುವಾಗ ಈ ಭರವಸೆ ಕೊಡುವ ಪ್ರಮೇಯವೇನಿತ್ತು? ಆಗಲೇ ಈ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆ ಬಂದಿತ್ತು. ಬೆಳಗಾವಿ ಕನ್ನಡ ರಾಜ್ಯಕ್ಕೆ ಸೇರಿದ ಪಟ್ಟಣ, ಆದುದರಿಂದ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಮರಾಠಿ ಸ್ನೇಹಿತರು ತಮ್ಮ ಕಾರ್ಯಕರಾಜಗಳನ್ನು ಮುಂದುವರಿಸಬಾರದೆಂಬ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆ ಬಂದ ಕಾರಣ ದಿಂದಲೇ ಆಗಿನ ಮಹಾರಾಷ್ಟ್ರ ನಾಯಕರು ಆ ಭರವಸೆಯನ್ನು ಕೊಡಬೇಕಾಗಿ ಬಂತು. ಯಾರೋ ಮೂರುನಾಲ್ಕು ಜನರು ಆಗ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದರೆ ಈಗ ನೂರಾರು ಜನರು, ನಾವು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇವೆ, ಇದರಿಂದ ನಡೆಯಲಿ ಎಂದು ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಬಲವಂತರಾಯರು ಹೇಳಿದರು. ಶ್ರೀ ಎಚ್. ಸಿ. ಕೇಳರ್ ಎಂದರೆ, ಅವರು ಮಹಾರಾಷ್ಟ್ರ ನಾಯಕರಲ್ಲ, ಮುಂಬಂದರಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಯಾವ ಮಹಾರಾಷ್ಟ್ರೀಯರೂ ಧಿಕ್ಕಾರ ಮಾಡುವುದಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಕಾಣುತ್ತದೆ. ಅವರು ಮುಂಬಂದರೆಂದು ನಾವೆಲ್ಲರೂ ಒಪ್ಪಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಹೀಗಿರುವಾಗ ಯಾರೋ ಆಗ ಭರವಸೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟರು ಎಂದು ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಬಲವಂತರಾಯರು ಹೇಳುವುದು ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲ. ಯಾವುದೋ ಉದ್ದೇಶನಾಥನೆಗಾಗಿ ನಾವು ನಮ್ಮ ಹಿರಿಯರನ್ನು ಧಿಕ್ಕಾರ ಮಾಡಬಾರದು. ಅವರು ಹಿರಿಯ ನಾಯಕರು, ಇದೀಗ ರಾಷ್ಟ್ರದಲ್ಲಿ ಓರಿಯ ನಾಯಕರ ಪಂಕ್ತಿಗೆ ಸೇರಿದ ನಾಯಕರು. ಅವರೊಬ್ಬರೇ ಅಲ್ಲ, ಇನ್ನೂ ಕೆಲವರು, ಆ ಸಾಹಿತ್ಯ ಸಮ್ಮೇಳನಕ್ಕೆ ಬಂದಿದ್ದ ಘಟಾನುಘಟಿ ನಾಯಕರು ಹೇಳಿದುದನ್ನು ಧಿಕ್ಕಾರ ಮಾಡಿ, ನಾವು ಅವರಿಗಿಂತ ದೊಡ್ಡ ನಾಯಕರು, ನಾವು ಹೇಳಿದುದಕ್ಕೆ ಬೇರೆ ಕೊಡಿ ಎನ್ನುವುದು ದೊಡ್ಡ ಮಾತು! ನಮ್ಮ ಸ್ನೇಹಿತರಾದ ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಎ. ಎಸ್. ಪಾಟೀಲ್ ಅವರು ಒಂದು ಪುಸ್ತಕದಿಂದ ಓದಿ "extended up to" ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರು. ಆದರೆ, "extended up to" ಎನ್ನುವುದಕ್ಕೂ 'inclusive of' ಎನ್ನುವುದಕ್ಕೂ ಅರ್ಥದಲ್ಲಿ ವ್ಯತ್ಯಾಸವಿದೆ ಎನ್ನುವುದನ್ನು ಅವರು ಯೋಚನೆ ಮಾಡಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ವರೆಗೆ ಗಡಿ ಎಂದರೆ ಬೆಂಗಳೂರೂ ಸೇರುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂದು ಅರ್ಥಮಾಡಿದರೆ ಹೇಗೆ ವಿಪರೀತಾರ್ಥವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ ಯೋ ಹಾಗೆಯೇ ಅವರು ಹೇಳಿದುದರಲ್ಲಿ ಆಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಮಹಾರಾಷ್ಟ್ರ ಏಕೀಕರಣ ಸಮಿತಿಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಚುನಾವಣೆಗೆ ನಿಂತಾಗ ಇದನ್ನೂ ಒಂದು ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಯಾಗಿ ಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡು ಒಟ್ಟು ಸುಪಾದನಮಾಡಿ ಸ್ಥಾನವನ್ನು ಗಳಿಸಿದರೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಇದು ಬೇರೆ ಮಾತು. ನಮಗೆ ಗೊತ್ತಿಲ್ಲದೇ ಇರುವ ವಿಷಯ. ಚುನಾವಣೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದೊಂದು ಪಕ್ಷದವರು ಒಂದೊಂದು ಧ್ಯೇಯದಿಂದ ಒಂದು ಅವರವರ ಧ್ಯೇಯದಿಂದ ಚುನಾವಣೆಯಾದರೂ ಒಂದು ಭಾಷಾವಾರು ವಿಷಯ ಅಂಗೀಕಾರವಾಗಿ ಅದನ್ನು ಜನರ ಮುಂದಿಟ್ಟು ಒಟ್ಟು ಪಡೆದು ಎಲ್ಲೆಯೂ ನನಗೆ ಗೊತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ. ಅವರು ವಾದಕ್ಕನುಗುಣವಾಗಿ ಕೆಲವು ಮಾತುಗಳನ್ನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಮರಾಠಾಧ್ಯರು ಆಗಲೇ ಕೆಲವಕ್ಕೆ

ಉತ್ತರ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅಲ್ಲಿನ ಮುನಿಸಿಪಾಲಟಿಯವರು 'ಸೆನ್ಸಸ್' ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದರು. ಅದರ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಎಂದು ಒಂದು ವಾದವನ್ನು ಮುಂದಿಟ್ಟರು. ಅವರವರ ಉಪಯೋಗಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಯಾರು ಬೇಕಾದರೂ ಸೆನ್ಸಸ್ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬಹುದು. ಸಂಗೀತ ಸಾಹಿತ್ಯ ಅಕಾಡೆಮಿಯವರು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬಹುದು, ಪರಿಷತ್ತಿನವರೂ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬಹುದು; ಅವರವರ ಅನುಕೂಲಕ್ಕೆ ಬೇಕಾದಹಾಗೆ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬಹುದು. ಆದರೆ ಯಾವುದನ್ನು ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕು? ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಒಪ್ಪಿ ಸೆನ್ಸಸ್ ಕಮೀಷನರು ತಯಾರುಮಾಡಿರುವ ಸೆನ್ಸಸ್ ಒಪ್ಪಬೇಕು. ಹೀಗಿರುವಾಗ ಬೆಳಗಾವಿ ಮುನಿಸಿಪಾಲಟಿಯವರು ಸೆನ್ಸಸ್ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದರು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರೆ ಅದನ್ನು ಹೇಗೆ ಒಪ್ಪುವುದು? ಅವರು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡಿರುವುದನ್ನು ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಸೆನ್ಸಸ್ ವರದಿಗೆ ಸೇರಿಸುವಹಾಗಿಲ್ಲ. ಆರೀತಿ ಮಾಡಿಯೂ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಪಾಟೀಲರು ಭಾಷೆಯ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಯ ಮೇಲೆ ಚುನಾವಣೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಒಟ್ಟು ಪಡೆದವು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುವ ಮಾತನ್ನು ನಾವು ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವಹಾಗಿಲ್ಲ. ಅದು ನಮಗೆ ಗೊತ್ತಿಲ್ಲದ ವಿಚಾರ. ಹೊಸ ರಾಜ್ಯವಾಗುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಮುಂಚೆ ಆದ ವಿಚಾರವನ್ನು ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಗಂಟುಹಾಕುವ ಅಗತ್ಯವಿಲ್ಲ.

ಕೆಲವು ಸ್ನೇಹಿತರು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಉಪಯೋಗಿಸಿರುವ ಪದಗಳ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಮಾತನಾಡುತ್ತಾ 'minor' ಎಂದರೇನು, 'major' ಎಂದರೇನು, ಎಲ್ಲಿ ಗೆರೆ ಎಳೆಯುವುದು ಎಂದು ಕೇಳಿದರು. ಇದನ್ನು ಕಾರ್ಯಗತ ಮಾಡುವಾಗ ಮಾತಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಅರ್ಥ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಹೀಗೆಯೇ ಎಂದು ಇದನ್ನು define ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ನೂರಾರು ಗ್ರಾಮಗಳು, ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು ಮತ್ತು ಜಿಲ್ಲಾ ಮುಖ್ಯ ಪಟ್ಟಣಗಳು, ಲಕ್ಷಾಂತರ ಜನರಿಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧ ಪಟ್ಟಿದ್ದು ಇವೆಲ್ಲ major ಆಗುತ್ತವೆ. 'Pockets' ಎಂದು ಯಾವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾರೋ ಸುತ್ತ ಮುತ್ತ ಬೇರೆ ಭಾಷೆ ಆಡುವ ಜನರಿದ್ದು ಮಧ್ಯೆ ಒಂದು ಹಳ್ಳಿ ಸೇರಿದ್ದರೆ, ಅದಕ್ಕೆ minor ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಬಹುದು. ಉದಾಹರಣೆಗೆ, ಮಡಕಶಿರಾವನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬಹುದು. ಮಡಕಶಿರಾದ ಸುತ್ತ ಮುತ್ತ ಮೈಸೂರಿನ ಪ್ರದೇಶವಿದೆ. ತುಮಕೂರಿನಿಂದ ಪಾವಗಡಕ್ಕೆ ಹೋಗಬೇಕಾದರೆ ಆಂಧ್ರಕ್ಕೆ ಸೇರಿರುವ ಮಡಕಶಿರಾದ ಮಧ್ಯೆ ಹೋಗಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಅಲ್ಲಿನ ಜನ ಮಾತನಾಡುವ ಭಾಷೆ ಕನ್ನಡ. ಅಡಳಿತಾನುಕೂಲದ್ವಾರ್ಥಿಯಿಂದ ನೋಡಿದರೆ, ಆ ಜನರು ಆಂಧ್ರಕ್ಕೆ ಹೋಗುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಹತ್ತಿರದಲ್ಲಿ ತುಮಕೂರು ಜಿಲ್ಲಾ ಕೇಂದ್ರವಿದೆ. ಹೀಗೆ ರಾಜಕೀಯ ಕಾರ್ಯಗತ ಮಾಡುವಾಗ ಜನರ ಅನುಕೂಲ ಮತ್ತು ಅಡಳಿತ ಸೌಕರ್ಯ ಇವುಗಳನ್ನು ನೋಡಬೇಕು. ಮಡಕಶಿರಾ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ನನ್ನ ಹಿಂದಿನ ಅನುಭವವನ್ನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ತುಮಕೂರಿನಿಂದ ಚಿತ್ರದುರ್ಗಕ್ಕೆ ಹೋಗಬೇಕಾದರೆ ಮಡಕಶಿರಾ ಭಾಗದಲ್ಲಿ ಹಾದುಹೋಗಬೇಕಾಗಿತ್ತು. ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಸ್ಪಷ್ಟರಾಗಿ ಕಾರ್ ರೈಸೆನ್ಸ್ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕಾಗಿತ್ತು. ಇಂಥಾದ್ದನ್ನು ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಸರ್ಕಾರಗಳೊಡನೆ ಸೇರಿ ಪರಸ್ಪರ ಒಡಂಬಡಿಕೆಯಿಂದ ಬದಲಾವಣೆ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬಹುದೆಂದು ನನ್ನ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ. ಇದೇನೂ ಹೊಸ ವಿಷಯವಲ್ಲ. ನಮ್ಮ ಹೊಸರಾಜ್ಯವಾಗುವುದಕ್ಕಿಂತ ಮುಂಚೆ ಸ್ವಾತಂತ್ರ್ಯ ಬಂದ ಮೇಲೆ ಮದರಾಸು ಮತ್ತು ಮೈಸೂರು ಸರ್ಕಾರಗಳಿಗೆ ಒಪ್ಪಂದವಾಗಿ, ಮದರಾಸಿಗೆ ಕೆಲವು ಗ್ರಾಮಗಳನ್ನು ವರ್ಗ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೇವೆ, ಅವರು ನಮಗೆ ಕೆಲವು ಗ್ರಾಮಗಳನ್ನು ವರ್ಗ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಪರಸ್ಪರ

ಮುನ್ನು ಸರಿಯಾಗಿದ್ದರೆ ಇದರಿಂದ ಕಷ್ಟವೇನೂ
ಉದ್ಭವವಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ.

ನಾನು ಇನ್ನು ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಕಾಲವನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಲು
ಇಷ್ಟಪಡುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಉತ್ತರ ಕೊಡಬೇಕಾದ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆ
ಗಳನ್ನು ಅಥವಾ ಅಂಶಗಳನ್ನು ಮರಾಠಿ ಸ್ನೇಹಿತರು
ಎತ್ತಿ ಹೇಳಿಲ್ಲ. ಅವರ ವಾದವನ್ನು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ.
ಒಂದು ಸಂತೋಷದ ವಿಚಾರವೇನೆಂದರೆ, ಈ ಸಭೆಯ
ಮಹಾರಾಷ್ಟ್ರ ಸ್ನೇಹಿತರು ಏನಾ ಮಿಕ್ಕಿಲ್ಲ ಸದಸ್ಯರೂ
ಈ ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ಪಕ್ಷಾಂತಿತವೆಂದು ಭಾವಿಸಿ, ಒಟ್ಟು
ದೇಶದ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆ ಎಂದು ತಿಳಿದು ಈ ನಿರ್ಣಯಕ್ಕೆ
ಬೆಂಬಲ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇದಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಮತ್ತೊಮ್ಮೆ
ನನ್ನ ವಂದನೆಗಳನ್ನರ್ಪಿಸಿ, ಇದನ್ನು ಸರ್ವಾನುಮತ
ದಿಂದ ಅನುಮೋದಿಸಬೇಕೆಂದು ಪ್ರಾರ್ಥಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ.

Sri B. D. JATTI (Chief Minister).—

Sir, I rise to support the resolution
moved by the Hon'ble Members Sri
Veeranna Gowdh and supported gene-
rally by all the Hon'ble Members who
have spoken so far. I do not wish to
deal with this question in detail
because this question has been discus-
sed for two days and all possible issues
have been effectively argued by those
who have supported the Resolution.

Sir, the points which have been
raised by my Maharashtrian friends
are not new points which have been
raised for the first time on the floor of
the House. Before the formation of
the new Mysore State.....

Sri V. S. PATIL.—I rise to a point of
order so far as the procedure is concer-
ned, Sir. I suppose that under Rule
295, it is said :

“subject to the provisions of
sub-rule (3) of Rule 294 the reply
of the mover of the original motion
shall in all cases conclude the
debate.”

It say 'in all cases.'

Mr. SPEAKER.—Please read Rule
294 (3):

“294 (3): A member who has
moved a motion may speak again
by way of reply, and if the motion
is moved by a private member, the
Minister concerned may, with the
permission of the Speaker, speak
(whether he has previously spoken
in the debate or not) after the
mover has replied.”

Sri B. D. JATTI.—Sir, I was refer-
ring to the points which have been

raised by the Hon'ble Members of the
House who are speaking Marathi. I
said this was not the first time that they
raised such arguments. These points
were raised before the Fazl Ali Commis-
sion. All these points were considered
by the Fazl Ali Commission. Members
from the Karnatak area have effectively
replied to these points and after a
consideration of these arguments and
counter-arguments, the Fazl Ali Com-
mission came to the conclusion that
except for Chandgad, the entire Belgaum
district should remain in the new
Mysore State or Karnataka. I do not
think any good purpose will be served
by arguing these points which have
been argued by our friends and
effectively replied by friends on the
other side.

Sir, without going into great detail,
I will try to touch some four or five
points. Sir, the movement regarding
the formation of Karnataka State is not
a new movement. It was started in the
year 1906. From that day, our people
have agitated for having a separate
province of their own. The Maharash-
trian friends when they were working
along with the Kannada friends in the
Congress organisation before the forma-
tion of the Karnataka Provincial
Congress Committee, never thought of
claiming either Belgaum or any area
from the Mysore State for Maharashtra.
A committee was appointed consisting
of two persons, namely, the Hon'ble
Pant and Sri N. C. Kelkar, to consider
about the area which should be included
within the jurisdiction of the Karnataka
Provincial Congress Committee. They
have submitted a report, wherein they
have included Belgaum District and
Karwar District within the jurisdic-
tional area of the Karnataka Provincial
Congress. At that time, no Maharash-
trian ever said that this area should
not be included within the jurisdiction
of the Karnatak Provincial Congress.
At that time people were not fighting
against each other. All people were
working under the same organisation
and if they really had any genuine
grievance they should have and they
would have brought it to the notice of
the appropriate authorities and they
would have had it included in the

(SRI B. D. JATTI)

Maharashtra Provincial Congress jurisdiction. They have never made that claim at all.

In the year 1924, the A.I.C.C. session was held at Belgaum at the instance of the Karnataka Provincial Congress Committee. Why was it held at Belgaum?

Sri V. S. PATIL.—I want some information, Sir. The Hon'ble Chief Minister is referring to the holding of the A.I.C.C. session arranged by the Karnataka Provincial Congress Committee. I should like to know what were the districts that were included in the Karnataka Provincial Congress Committee or the Karnataka Province of that time, whether this area as well as the area of ex-Hyderabad were included in it.

Sri B. D. JATTI.—If the constitution of the Karnataka Provincial Congress Committee is read by my Hon'ble friend, he will not raise any of these points at all, Sir. Belgaum District was definitely included in the constitution of the Karnataka Provincial Congress Committee. When the open Session was held in Belgaum, it was held in the Karnataka area and Belgaum had an important place in the Karnataka province jurisdiction. At that time, no Congressman ever raised any objection, stating that Belgaum belongs to Maharashtra and as such it should be included in Maharashtra.

Sri B. VAIKUNTA BALIGA.—Belgaum was included along with South Kanara District.

Sri B. D. JATTI.—There is no dispute relating to South Kanara and therefore I am not touching on that point, Sir.

Sir, again in the year 1929.....

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಅವರು ಹೇಳುವುದು ಮೈಸೂರು, ಹೈದರಾಬಾದ್ ಮತ್ತು ಮದ್ರಾಸ್ ಕನ್ನಡ ಪ್ರದೇಶಗಳನ್ನು ಕೆ.ಪಿ.ಸಿ.ಸಿ. ಯಲ್ಲಿ ಸೇರಿಸಿದ್ದರು ಎಂದು.

Sri B. D. JATTI.—Yes, Sir. Nobody took into consideration whether it was a Princely State or it was British territory. All Kannada-speaking people were included in the Provincial Congress Committee's jurisdiction.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNA PPA.—It was for administrative purpose that the Congress did it.

Sri H. K. VEERANNA GOWDH.—Sir, so far as the Congress Provinces were concerned, Belgaum, Dharwar, parts of Hyderabad and old Mysore—all were within the jurisdiction of the Karnataka Provincial Congress and some of us were members of the K.P.C.C. and members of the Executive Committee also.

Sri B. D. JATTI.—Sir, in the year 1929, the Maharashtra Sahitya Sammelana was held in Belgaum and it was addressed by important top-ranking Maharashtrians. They have declared in unequivocal terms that Belgaum belongs to Karnataka and they have no dispute about it. Sir, I have got with me the Marathi version of it also. If anybody wants, I will read it for the information of the House.

Sri V. S. PATIL.—What is the use?

Sri B. D. JATTI.—Sir, this is the background against which this question was discussed and considered. When the Fazl Ali Commission discussed the report and decided that it might be included in the new State of Mysore, which is the Karnataka State, there is no use in raising all these points once again.

Sri T. TARE GOWDA.—Who presided over that Congress Session, Sir?

Sri B. D. JATTI.—If Mahatma Gandhi has presided over the Session, it is not necessary for me to tell an Hon'ble Member of the Congress Party itself.

Sir, this question was also discussed in the Bombay Legislative Assembly when the Bill was introduced in the Parliament. At that time, the same points were raised and the same replies were given. Ultimately the question was considered on the floor of the Houses of Parliament, amendments were also moved by the Maharashtrian friends and those amendments were either withdrawn or failed. Ultimately it became an Act of Parliament. The only point for consideration today is that while the Bill was piloted by the Hon'ble Minister for Home Affairs, he made a reference to minor boundary

adjustment which could be made, he said, provided the question was considered in the Zonal Council and provided the representatives of the States concerned would agree. That is the only point under issue. To that extent we have to consider the question and the Government of Mysore is considering that point. Otherwise, if we look at the law strictly, section by section as pointed out by my Hon'ble friend Sri Mallaradhya, there is no scope for re-opening the discussion on this subject. Since it has been assured by the Hon'ble Mover himself and since we are interested in solving minor boundary adjustments between the two States, whether it is Bombay and Mysore or other States, we are saying on behalf of the Government that there is scope for minor boundary adjustment provided both Governments come to an amicable understanding and settlement. That we are trying to do. On behalf of the Government of this State, I can say that the proposal was made by the Government of Mysore that a four-maa Committee should be constituted with two representatives of the Government of Mysore and two representatives on the Government of Bombay and these representatives should negotiate with the respective persons and come to an understanding regarding minor boundary adjustment; and if there are some points on which they have come to some agreement, such points may be placed before the Chief Ministers of the States concerned. If they have agreed, those points should be accepted. If the representatives in the Four-man Committee cannot agree, such points should be dropped. That is the proposal which has been sent by the Government of Mysore. Till today, I have not got the final approval of the Government of Bombay through the Government of India. This is the position regarding the proposal which the Government of Mysore has sent to the Government of India to convey to the Government of Bombay.

8-00 P.M.

Regarding the point raised about the percentage of people speaking Marathi and Kannada—I was also in that

Bombay Government as Deputy Minister—Census was taken in the year 1951. At that time there were a lot of complaints against the enumerators appointed by the Municipality of Belgaum. In all 79 enumerators were appointed by the Municipality. Out of 79, 73 were Marathi speaking enumerators. The Government of Bombay received several complaints. Hon'ble Sri Datar, who was not a Minister then, had also sent some complaints. Government considered these and as a result Mr. Bomen, who was the Census Commissioner, himself personally came to Belgaum. He looked into the whole file and he has given a note in the Census book that for official calculation or for any legal purposes, it cannot be taken as correct. Therefore, where is the point in saying that the percentage is higher or lower? I do not understand. This should be taken as a fact. This is correct and there cannot be any argument. (Interruption). If the Hon'ble Members see the Census book, it is a book which has to be accepted. If there is a note by the Census Commissioner, then it must be taken as true. These are the facts.

While this resolution was being discussed some of the Hon'ble Members from Marathi speaking areas have raised one or two points. I wish to clarify and finish. It was said by Sri Balawant Rao that in a Girls' High School in Bidar district, some of the Marathi classes have been stopped. I enquired into the matter and I have got the information that it is not correct. Very recently the Minister for Education had been to Bidar.

Sri BALWANT RAO.—I said that Marathi schools are stopped in Howra.

Sri B. D. JATTI.—Whether in Howra or in any other area, my information is correct. The Minister for Education has also visited these High Schools, particularly the Girls' High Schools. To my enquiries about this, he said to me that nowhere Government had stopped any classes where Marathi was taught for boys or girls. I may state further that if there are a number of students who are prepared to go to high schools or to primary schools.

(SRI B. D. JATTI)

Government has been liberal in sanctioning a number of teachers for the primary and high schools. If you take the data of Marathi schools when the new Mysore State was formed and the schools we have given up-to-date you will find that there are many more primary Marathi schools as compared to the existing number when we came from Bombay. If anybody denies this, I can give the figures even tomorrow,

Regarding the training college, there is one training college at Wadgam. That training college is meant for teaching in Marathi. The medium of instruction there is Marathi. There, Government is giving a grant regularly. If the Government is not interested in supporting that college, where Marathi teachers are trained, Government would not have given grants. There is a proposal before the Government of Mysore for sanctioning an amount of Rs. 25,000 for the purchase of a building for that college. Government is favourably inclined to purchase the building wherein they are running that college. Very recently there was a representation from the people to the effect that more number of teachers—Marathi teachers—were required. The Government of Mysore decided to start a branch in the Jamkhandi Training College, where Kannada teachers are trained. Since a year, Marathi teachers are being trained in that college and special arrangements were made.

I will quote one more instance and close. While we were in the Bombay State, at that time, Sangli State was merged in Bombay State. In Belgaum district, there is a high school called the Chintamani Rao High Schools. Then the Raja Saheb of Sangli had donated a sum of Rs. 80,000 for the construction of this high school. But as the amount of gift given by the Raja Saheb was utilised for other purposes, the Government of Bombay could not give any money for this high school, in spite of repeated representations made by various people. I was one amongst them who also represented, because I was representing merged Deccan States areas. We fought and could not get

the amount. They said that it was not possible. After the formation of Mysore, the Government of Mysore has sanctioned a grant of Rs. 80,000 for this school. In spite of doing all this if anybody says that Marathi language has been neglected and the Government of Mysore has not given grants or it is not helping the Marathi students to be taught in Marathi, I do not think there is any other argument to convince them.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—I hope the same help will be given to Telugu, Tamil and Urdu schools.

Sri B. D. JATTI.—We do not make any distinction between any language. If 20 students or above come forward to be taught in a language, we are prepared to start classes for teaching students through the medium of their mother-tongue, whether it is Telugu, Tamil or Urdu. We do not make any distinction. Let me make it clear.

Regarding the agitation, much has been made of by my friend. I am not referring to Sri Patil. Sri Sunthakar wants to show here on the floor of the House, that whatever he is doing, whatever the Samithi people are doing, they are doing it on Gandhian principles. It is not so. I have to say it with restraint. What he says is not correct. For that I can quote one instance. Recently when I made a statement regarding the recovery of land assessment, I said that people were willing to pay the revenues to the officers, and I said in that connection that 54 Police Constables five Police Officers and two Panchayat officers were injured, five people of the Maharashtra Ekikarana Samithi received injuries and had taken treatment in the hospital. Very recently, it was stated that my Hon'ble friends Sri Birje and Sri Samaji were not present there. They were there when the land assessment was to be recovered by the Deputy Commissioner with the assistance of the D.S.P. They were found there in the village. But when the firing incident took place, they disappeared from Belgaum. I will only say that their statement is not correct and it is far from truth. It is no use arguing on the floor of this House that they are

conducting this agitation non-violently. They are not doing anything of that kind. People are not agitating. They have no mind to agitate. I say that the villagers in the border areas are willing to pay the land revenue. Some have paid voluntarily. At that time 174 Kathedars in a group paid the assessment. They informed the Deputy Commissioner that it was only due to the fear of the M.E.S. that they were afraid to come and pay the revenue singly, but in company they were not afraid and they were going to pay. That is the position of the agitation. They started Satyagraha and they have completely failed. The 'no-tax campaign' has failed, and they have no face to show to the people to prove that they have been successful. Mere threats will not help them and the Government of Mysore will not be threatened like that. If law and order are to be maintained and if life and property of the people are to be protected by the Government of Mysore or by any other Government, effective steps must be taken. We are not afraid of agitators or goonda elements and we will deal with them with a firm hand. I can assure that we are not going to do harm to anybody. If there is any mistake on the part of the Police Department or on the part of any other department, we are going to enquire and take necessary action. The other points have been dealt with in detail by several Hon'ble Members who supported the resolution. In the Council also a similar resolution was moved by one of the Hon'ble Members of that House and it has been passed there unanimously. Here also most of the members who spoke have supported the resolution moved by my Hon'ble friend Sri Veeranna Gowdh and I too join with them.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—You did not refute the statement made by the Bombay Chief Minister regarding Nipani.

Sri B. D. JATTI.—Regarding that I may say that I met the Chief Minister of Bombay Mr. Chavan once in Bombay for the first time. That was for informal discussion between the two Chief Ministers. I was with him for about

45 minutes or so. He wanted to explain to me regarding the formula of Pataskar. When I heard that formula, I explained to him that it was not possible for me to accept the formula enunciated by Pataskar because the position was quite different. In the case of Madras and Andhra, there was some disputed area and both of them had agreed to appoint an arbitrator and the basis adopted was contiguity and 51 per cent of the population speaking a particular language. But in the case of Mysore and Bombay there is no disputed area. The whole question was argued and fought by both sides. There were arguments and counter-arguments and documents were also produced. Therefore, it is after full deliberation that this question was decided. Therefore, there is not an inch of space which is said to be a disputed area. That is why I did not agree to the proposal of Pataskar. So, we agreed to disagree and we dispersed. Then again I met him once or twice in the Zonal Council. As that time I have never stated that I am going to give either Nipani or any village. Again I met the Chief Minister of Bombay in the residence of the Hon'ble Minister for Home Sri Pantji. There also I have never made a statement that I am going to part with Nipani or any other border area. While we were discussing casually, so many proposals were thought of. Some proposals were placed before me. Shahapur was originally in the Sangli State and after the merger of Sangli in Bombay State, Shahapur was merged in Belgaum. So, somebody suggested that Shahapur should be given to Maharashtra and the original Belgaum should be retained. Similarly somebody said, "Why unnecessarily go on fighting with each other? Why not give Nipani and contiguous areas to Maharashtra and close the chapter?" I said it was not possible for me to say anything about those proposals without consulting my other colleagues in the Cabinet and in the Congress Legislature Party and without bringing the matter before Zonal Council, I said I have no authority to part with any area because I cannot do anything in my personal

(SRI B. D. JATTI)

capacity. That was why I really wanted to bring this matter before the House but since the Hon'ble Member Sri Veeranna Gowdh himself has come forward with this resolution I in consonance with the stand I have taken, wholeheartedly support it. I also thank Sri Veeranna Gowdh particularly and other members who have supported the resolution.

MR. SPEAKER.—The question is :

'After the word "boundaries" in line 2, add "between Bombay State and Mysore State".'

The amendment was adopted.

MR. SPEAKER.—The question is :

'1. In clause (1), for the words "minor adjustment agreed to by the States concerned", the words "readjusting the boundaries on the basis of linguistic majority, contiguity taking village as a unit and wishes of the people expressed through democratic ways."

2. Clause (2) shall be deleted.

3. The word "such" occurring in line (2) of clause (3) shall be deleted.

4. For clause (4), the following shall be substituted :—

"and that this Assembly requests the Government to take immediate steps to meet the legitimate demand of the Marathi speaking people in the border areas between Mysore and Bombay States by conceding to allow these areas to be integrated with the Bombay State."

The amendment was negatived.

SRI M. C. NARASIMHAN.—Sir, beg to withdraw my amendment.

The amendment was, by leave, withdrawn.

MR. SPEAKER.—The question is :

"(1) This Assembly earnestly requests the Government of India

to reaffirm that the boundaries between Bombay State and Mysore State settled by Parliament under the States Reorganisation Act of 1956 should not be disturbed in the interest of unity and integrity of India and her national development except for minor adjustments agreed to by the States concerned.

(2) This Assembly expresses its great concern at the repeated attempts made by certain elements from outside the State to foment trouble among the people of the Mysore-Bombay border area by continued unhealthy propaganda and consequent breaches of law and order.

(3) This Assembly records its appreciation of the stand taken by the people of that area in not encouraging such unlawful activities.

(4) And this Assembly while supporting the stand and steps taken by the Government of Mysore calls upon the agitators to abandon such objectionable activities which are likely to create disaffection amongst the people of the said area."

The resolution, as amended, was adopted.

SRI B. R. SUNTHANKAR.—We ask for division.

(A count was taken of those who were in favour of the resolution and of those who were against it.

61 members were in favour of the resolution and 6 members were against it.)

MR. SPEAKER.—The resolution, as amended, is adopted. The House will now rise and meet tomorrow at 1 P.M.

The House adjourned at Fifteen Minutes past Eight of the Clock to meet again at One of the Clock on Tuesday, the 15th March 1960.